

FREEDOM LOVE COMMUNITY

(Festschrift in honour of
Metropolitan
Paulos Mar Gregorios)

Edited by
K.M.GEORGE

ABOUT THE BOOK

Freedom, Love, Community—No better words are there to express the world of thought and the vision of Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios. His quest for freedom has been a long struggle—intense, committed and thorough going. It continues to inspire, and at times provoke, men and women around the world. His search is for an unusual combination of disciplined power, love and wisdom manifested in a community as the pre-requisite of authentic human freedom. It is the depth and freshness of this vision that is at the root of its power of provocation and inspiration. The sweeping and amazing interest of Metropolitan Gregorios in science and technology, in religions and philosophy, in peace and justice, in economic theories and political models has but one single focus—the Kingdom of God.

This small book is but a joyful testimony by some of his distinguished friends and grateful students to the power of being which God has so graciously bestowed on Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios.

Cover design by G. RAVI

Price : Rs. 20.00

(This price applies to India only)

FREEDOM LOVE COMMUNITY

Festschrift in Honour of Metropolitan
Paulos Mar Gregorios

Edited by
K. M. GEORGE



THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY

Published by
THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY
POST BOX 501, PARK TOWN
MADRAS-600 003, INDIA

© C.L.S., 1985
First Published in 1985

PRINTED IN INDIA
AT THE DIOCESAN PRESS, MADRAS-600 007—C5877

INTRODUCTION

Freedom, Love, Community—No better words are there to express the world of thought and the vision of Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios. His quest for freedom has been a long struggle, intense, committed and thoroughgoing. It continues to inspire and at times provoke men and women around the world. His search is for an unusual combination of disciplined power, love and wisdom manifested in a community as the pre-requisite of authentic human freedom. It is the depth and freshness of this vision that is at the root of its power of provocation and inspiration. He witnessed at close quarters the crumbling down of traditional forms and structures of authority, from imperial to professorial. He had the privilege of assisting in his own way at some of the historic movements of human liberation—of students, blacks and women.

Metropolitan Gregorios has consistently sought to interpret to us the integral relation between freedom, love and community. Freedom comes easily to the fore-front of his thought. He recognizes it as 'the invariable concomitant of true love' and the authentic expression of the living community of the Spirit. Only such communities where true freedom grows in love can become the matrices of a sustainable human civilization where justice and peace embrace each other.

The sweeping and amazing interest of Metropolitan Gregorios in science and technology, in religions and philosophy, in peace and justice, in economic theories and political models has but one single focus—the Kingdom of God. Human beings are to participate in this Kingdom not as passive subjects but as kings. God in Christ has called humanity to share his own Kingship. Every creative impulse in mankind is one step forward to the realization of humanity's royal destiny. But God the King is also a good shepherd. His kingly authority is rooted in his self-sacrificing love and service for the sheep as Christ exemplified it in his own life. So for Mar Gregorios any form of human authority to be genuine and conducive to human freedom must basically be a shepherdly authority.

Metropolitan Gregorios does not consider human nature to be stationary or incapable of moving towards good because of sin. His conviction that man is created good and that sin is alien to true of human nature is basic to his very dynamic Christian vision of man. Human nature is a task to be achieved. Transfiguring human nature in the direction of the good is possible. It is to be realized in freedom and love and with the help of the sustaining structures of a freedom-fostering community open to all. In shaping this vision Mar Gregorios acknowledges his great debt to his namesake the bishop of Nyssa, that amazing Christian mind of the fourth century produced by the Asian-African tradition of Christianity. The astounding contemporaneity of Gregory of Nyssa has been abundantly made clear to us in several of the works of Mar Gregorios. It was this Gregorian vision which persuaded Metropolitan Gregorios to take a critical stance with regard to the Augustinian distortion of faith and the 'intellectual pseudomorphosis' of Christianity deep rooted in the Western tradition. Instead of seeing God, man and the world as three disjunct realities as taught by some of the most brilliant of Western teachers, Mar Gregorios holds on to an integral vision of reality in which the whole order of creation continuously ascends to share the very goodness of the Creator in love, joy and freedom. The union of God and man initiated in Christ is an eternal process which sets no limit to human growth in mind and spirit. This integral vision carries tremendous significance for all areas of human concern and pursuit, from Ecology to Political Economy, from Particle Physics to Parapsychology.

Mar Gregorios places his final trust in the Holy Spirit of God who perfects the creation through a variety of modes and operations. Whether in the community of faith or in the scientific community it is the same Spirit that creates, relates and fructifies. The Spirit makes possible today a celebration of our faith and freedom in Christ as an antidote to the over-celebration of faith in our times. This celebration is at the heart of the projected human community where 'work is play, where the reality principle and the pleasure principle are mutually reconciled'. Presenting in a coherent way the polyvalent mind of Metropolitan Gregorios and interpreting to the

world the implications of his integral and dynamic vision is a great task yet to be accomplished by those discerning persons who understand and love him.

This small book is but a joyful testimony by some of his distinguished friends and grateful students to the power of being which God has so graciously bestowed on Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios.

—K.M.G.

NOTE ON THE AUTHORS

Father Bede Griffiths, an English Benedictine monk, is the founder of the Satchidananda Ashram in Tamil Nadu, India where he now lives.

Archbishop Kirill of Vyborg is Archbishop of the Russian Orthodox Church and the Rector of the Leningrad Theological Academy, U.S.S.R.

Dr. M. M. Thomas formerly Moderator of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, is now living at Tiruvalla, Kerala, India.

Bishop Karoly Toth of the Reformed Church in Hungary is the President of the Christian Peace Conference and the Vice-President of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches.

Guru Nitya Chaitanya Yati is the Superior of the 'Narayana Gurukulas' in India and the President of the East-West University of Brahavidya in the U.S.A.

Dr. Robert Nelson is Professor of Systematic Theology, Boston University, Massachusetts, U.S.A.

Prof. K. M. Tharakan, formerly Professor of English Literature, is editor, writer and literary critic in Malayalam.

Father Jacob Kurian is Lecturer in Theology and Religions, Orthodox Theological Seminary, Kottayam, India.

Father C. C. Cherian is chief librarian at the Orthodox Theological Seminary, Kottayam, India.

Rev. Dr. K. M. George, Editor, is teaching Theology at the Orthodox Theological Seminary, Kottayam, India.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction	iii
Note on the Authors	vi
1. Love and Community in the Ultimate State <i>Bede Griffiths</i>	1
2. Liberation by Modern Science or From it ? <i>J. Robert Nelson</i>	7
3. Disarmament as Prelude to Building a World Community of Peace and Justice <i>Bishop Karoly Toth</i>	21
4. A Spirituality for combat <i>M. M. Thomas</i>	31
5. Theology of Unity in Orthodox Ecclesiology <i>Archbishop Kirill of Vyborg</i>	39
6. Mysticism and Science <i>Nitya Chaitanya Yati</i>	46
7. <i>Eleutheria</i> and <i>Mukti</i> : An Indian Christian Appreciation of 'Freedom' <i>Jacob Kurian</i>	56
8. Creative Fidelity : from Gregory of Nyssa to Paulos Mar Gregorios <i>K. M. Tharakan</i>	64
9. Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios : A Bibliography Prepared by <i>C. C. Cherian</i>	74

1. LOVE AND COMMUNITY IN THE ULTIMATE STATE

BEDE GRIFFITHS

A Christian in India is always faced with the fact that for the Hindu as well as for the Buddhist the ultimate Reality, the ultimate state of man and the universe, is always seen in terms of 'non-duality'. As the Upanishads constantly assert, Brahman—the Supreme Reality—is *ekam eva advitiya*, one only without a second. How can this be reconciled with the Christian belief that the ultimate Reality—God—is Love and the ultimate end of man is communion in Love? I think that we have to take seriously this claim that ultimate Reality is one. Even the Hindu who is not an *advaitin* and who believes in a personal God of love, will yet insist that the ultimate truth is to be found beyond the personal God in the fathomless abyss of Being, which is Nirguna Brahman—Brahman 'without attributes' as opposed to Saguna Brahman—Brahman 'with attributes.' In Christian tradition too we have the teaching of Dionysius the Areopagite, that the ultimate truth is to be known by 'unknowing' in the darkness 'beyond being'. This is the Paradox which is faced by mystics of all religions, Muslims and Christians as well as Hindu and Buddhist. God, the ultimate Reality, is beyond word and thought. He cannot be described or properly conceived. Whatever we may say of him, we have to add '*neti, neti*'—not this, not this, 'for there is nothing higher than when one says "not this" '.

Perhaps Christians as a whole are not sufficiently aware of this paradox. Every term which we use about God is a term of analogy. We can never say properly 'what God is'. Dionysius the Areopagite again has laid down the fundamental principles about all discourse about God. We can say that God is Being, Truth, Beauty, Love, Creator, Saviour, the Supreme Person, but then we have immediately to deny that God is any of these things in any way that we can comprehend. We have therefore to say that God is not Being, not Truth, not Beauty etc and not a Person in any human sense. But then we can go on to the way of 'eminence' and say that God is all these things but in a way

which transcends all human comprehension. When we say therefore that God is a Person, we have to be very careful and consider very carefully what we are saying. God is certainly not a Person in any human sense. A Person is being possessed of intellect and will, a capacity for knowledge and love. But God has not got an intellect as we understand it nor a will, and the knowledge and love of God are beyond our comprehension.

This is the great truth which the Hindu doctrine of *advaita* is intended to preserve. Christians too easily fall into a facile kind of anthropomorphism. The God of the Old Testament in particular is always pictured in anthropomorphic terms and this can easily lead to a false conception of the divine nature. We need continually to go back to the insight of Dionysius, which is also that of the Hindu and the Buddhist, that God is always beyond our conception. God is the supreme mystery, the ineffable Reality which escapes all definition, the transcendent, the 'holy', as Rudolph Otto called it. This idea of the 'holy' is, in fact, fundamental to Biblical thought. The God of Israel is a 'holy' God; he dwells in cloud and darkness. 'No man has seen God at any time.' St. Gregory of Nyssa in his great work on the life of Moses describes how Moses went up on to the mountain and met God in the darkness. This is for him the symbol of the Christian approach to God. We have to go beyond word and thought, beyond the sensible and the intelligible world, if we are to encounter God in himself. How then are we to know God? The author of the little English mystical treatise called the *Cloud of Unknowing* has well answered this question. 'By love he can be gotten and holden, but by thought or understanding never.' The distinction between knowledge and love is this. By knowledge we receive the form or idea of a person or a thing into ourselves and our knowledge is conditioned by our limitations of mind. But in love we go out to a person or a thing in itself; love reaches out to reality beyond anything we can see or know. This is why we can love God in himself while we never know him in himself.

This is the great secret of Christian mysticism. God can be known by love. 'If any man love me', Jesus said, 'he will

keep my word and my Father will love him, and we will come and make our abode with him'. This is the secret of love. When we love God, we discover that God loves us, or rather we discover that our very love for God is itself an effect of God's love for us. Thus love leads to knowledge but not to ordinary knowledge. As St. Paul says, we shall know the love of God which surpasses knowledge. This is the only true knowledge of God, the knowledge which comes from love. But this love takes us ever deeper into the knowledge of God. We discover that God is himself love. This was the great discovery of St. John: 'Beloved, let us love one another; for he who loves is born of God and knows God... for God is love'. This is the greatest insight that has ever been made into the nature of God. God is himself love. But this means that there is some kind of communion in God. It is impossible for one to love; love demands two. It is from this insight that the Christian doctrine of the Trinity is derived. We cannot know God in the ordinary sense, but when we love, we learn that love is communion, and we experience God in a communion of love. We experience the love of God 'poured into our hearts' by the Holy Spirit 'who is given to us', and we recognise that this love of the Holy Spirit is the love of God himself in us. God loving himself in us, and revealing himself as love.

But St. John also tells us that this love of God is known when we love one another. We have to learn to love by loving others. 'How can you love God whom you have not seen, if you do not love your brother whom you have seen?'. Human existence is properly a school of love. It is by learning to love people who in themselves are often difficult to love, that we discover the true meaning of love. It is the painful process of forming a community of love which teaches us what the love of God really means. In this process we have to learn to go beyond the person with his or her individual character with all its faults and limitations, and discover hidden in each person the image of God. God is present in every human being, and in every created thing. Love teaches us to go out to that person as an image of God, to go out to the presence of God in him. There is a beautiful passage in the *Brihad Aranyaka Upanishad* which says: 'not for the sake of the husband is the husband

dear, but for the sake of the Self (the spirit, the true person) is the husband dear. Not for the sake of the wife is the wife dear, but for the sake of the Self is the wife dear', and soon through all human relationships. The Self, the true Person, in every human being is not the little isolated individual self, but the inner person, who is united to God and to others. It is this person which has to be loved, and in loving him or her we are loving God in him.

It is at this point that we may see a way to reconcile the Hindu view of man's ultimate destiny with that of the Christian. In the Biblical view man is made in the image of God, and the Greek Fathers interpreted this to mean that each man is a kind of mirror held up to God, so that God is reflecting himself in each person. If the mirror is covered with dust or cracked by sin, then it will give a feeble image or a distorted one. But if the mirror is clean, then the divine light will shine on it. What is to be loved in each person is the divine light which is shining in the heart. A human community of love is formed when each person recognises in the other this image of God, this reflection of the divine light. The same image is found in Sankara, who compares the divine light in the world to the sun shining in a pool of water. There is only one light, but that light is reflected in the water and in every drop in the water. So the world is a mirror held up to God, the source of life and light, and every created being reflects that divine light in its own way. In Sankara's view, it would seem, the mirror is *maya*, and is ultimately unreal, and in the end there is nothing but the one Brahman shining in his own light. The created world disappears in the one Reality.

In a Christian view we can retain the image of the mirror, but we can say that the divine light reflects itself uniquely in each creature and in every human being. In the ultimate state of man and the universe each creature is perfectly transparent to the divine light, so that the one light shines equally in all. There is no more 'duality' in the ordinary sense. Each is united with all and the all is reflected in each. This was beautifully expressed by Plotinus when he said: 'all is transparent, nothing is dark, nothing resistant, every being is lucid to every

other in breadth and depth; light running through light and each of them contains all within itself, and at the same time sees all in every other, so that everywhere there is all, and all is and each is all, and infinite the glory'.

This is what is revealed in the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ. In that Body each person is united with every other person in love, and the love which unites them is the love of the Holy Spirit, who is himself of Love. All these persons united in love form the members of the Body of Christ, who is himself the Image of God. All are persons in the one Person, and all together, as St. Gregory of Nyssa said, form 'one Image of Him Who Is'. Thus this communion of human beings, and in a sense of the whole universe, since man through his body is part of (the whole universe, is itself part of) that communion by which the Son, who is the Image of God, loves the Father, the Source of all, and the Father and the Son are united in the Holy Spirit. Is not this a kind of Christian *advaita*? There is one Spirit in all men and in all things, uniting the whole creation in the bonds of love, and this Spirit, this Love is God himself. This union of all men and all things in the love of God is itself an Image of God, a participation in the love which the Son has for the Father and the Father for the Son. Altogether form one Person, one image, in which each yet retains his own unique individuality. And this image of man and the universe in Christ is a reflection of the Father, the ineffable Source of the Godhead, the Nirguna Brahman, the 'One without a second', who has gathered the whole creation to himself and made it one in his Son, who is 'the Image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation.' All communion of men on earth can never be anything more than a dim reflection of this communion of the Persons of the Trinity. The supreme truth of the Christian revelation is this revelation of a communion of love in the Godhead, which means that love is the ultimate Reality, and this love cannot be known except by love. It is through the 'love of the brethren' that we come to know the love of God, and again it is through the love of God that we learn what human love should be.

NOTES

1. *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad*. 2.3.6.
2. *John*. 1 : 18.
3. *Cloud of Unknowing*. Ch. 6.
4. *John*. 14 : 23.
5. *Ephesians*. 3 : 19.
6. 1 *John*. 4 : 7.
7. *Romans*. 5 : 5.
8. 1 *John*. 4 : 20.
9. *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad*. 2.4.4.
10. Plotinus. *Enneads*. 5.8.4.
11. *Colossians*. 1 : 15.

2. 'LIBERATION BY MODERN SCIENCE— OR FROM IT?'

J. ROBERT NELSON

A Prefatory Acknowledgement

One of the most remarkable of the many accomplishments Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios has been his leadership in the World Council of Churches' great project on 'Faith, Science and the Future'. As Moderator of the Commission on Church and Society he was also Moderator of the World Conference which met in July, 1979 at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Not only did he preside at this notable assemblage, but he lectured and discussed the deepest issues of theology and philosophy in relation to the present pervasive and rapidly expanding effects of science and technology. For an original and learned treatment of these issues, the reader should study his book, *Science for Sane Societies* (Christian Literature Society, Madras 1980).

The essay which follows is neither an appraisal of his distinctive views nor a reconsideration of the merits of the 1979 conference. It is the writer's personal reflection upon the ambiguous significance of contemporary and future scientific technology with a brief suggestion of the lineaments of an appropriate theology for Christians to articulate within their own cultures.

Many advocates of liberation-theology and contextual-theology seem to have a blind-spot about science. With full justification they have much to say about politics and economics as well as militarism and racism. These are the main components of the exploitative and oppressive powers from which many millions of people strive to be emancipated. And the recognition that religious faith—or better the one God of faith—is on the side of the poor and oppressed people is indeed a liberating concept. This is increasingly seen as an effectual theology of the people rather than of the academic specialists.

It combines specific action as well as reflection upon religious and moral truth. The interplay of action and reflection produces a social ferment which at least weakens the hold of the oppressors. And it generates some hope that the powers of economics and politics might be employed in such a way as to benefit rather than burden the greatest number of human beings.

But what about science and technology? If theology is to be 'done' in the most important contexts, it is evident that the context of our society today is shaped by science-based technology. We all live day-by-day in that context. Only a few can escape it if they will.

Science and technology are also of concern to theological reflection and practical action. Each day we are involved in both the uses of science-based technology and the critical thinking about the implications of science for human good or for ill. And if we use technology and *think* of its ambiguities in the light of revealed religion, or God's Word, then we are *doing* liberation-theology, too. From this necessity of reflection and action there is no responsible escape.

The stereotyped notion that science and Biblically-based faith are mutually exclusive still has wide currency. It should be challenged and demolished. Still it persists not only in uncritical, popular mentality but in the minds of well-educated persons. It appears in the annual meetings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, which includes one hundred and thirty thousand members of many scientific specialties. Seminars in the 1982 meeting were headed 'Science and Belief,' implying clearly that belief has no place in science. A featured lecturer at the 1981 meeting, a noted historian of science, declared categorically and without audible challenge, 'Christianity has ceased to exist. Science has replaced it.' His assumption, also widely shared, is that the only legitimate attitude of the scientist is that of scientific materialism which depends solely upon undeviating empiricism as the mode of gaining knowledge.

When an absolutist position is expressed absolutely it arouses reaction from the opposing side. In America, more

than elsewhere, the increasingly vocal religious opponents of science are intensifying the relationship of hostility. They are using their considerable political strength and mobilizing Christians of literalistic Biblical belief to advance the policy in public education of teaching the creation stories of *Genesis* as a 'scientific' alternative to prevailing scientific theories of cosmogony and the origin of species of organisms and of humanity. A fair analogy to what they are urging could be found in India, where conceivably some ardent Hindus might insist that the 'Dance of Life' by Shiva Nataraja be regarded as a 'scientific' alternative to the theories taught in schools and universities about the origin of the cosmos.

Where there is such a stand-off between scientists and people of certain firm religious conviction what are we to say? That the Bible is wrong and scientists right? That religious myth is too sectarian to merit discussion in schools? No. It is not so simple.

Should the creation accounts of *Genesis* be taught in secular schools? Of course, they should be. But the teaching should be in accord with the manifest purpose of those creation stories. The purpose was never to give a once-for-all factual description of how the world of nature, animals and humankind came into being. The original purpose was, and remains, to provide the setting for God's covenant with Israel and with all people; further, to establish the basis for human responsibility by using the created world in the mode of prudent stewardship unto God. Children should at least know this, whether or not they are led by religious nurture to believe in God's purposes for creation and humanity.

Sterile disputes between certain kinds of scientists and people with certain religious convictions—equally dogmatic in their opposing views—are self-contradictory. It is literally unscientific of scientists to ignore the persistent reality of religious, biblical and theological conceptions. And it is equally unfaithful to believe that God does not want people to know anything about the created world except what is printed in the Bible.

What, then, is a right relationship between the bodies of knowledge which belong to religious faith and those of experimental and applied sciences? Is there a way which is both faithful to religious faith and scientifically responsible to science? Yes. It is the way of dialectical interaction.¹ It is a dialogue which mutually informs, criticizes and to some degree provides ways of co-operation in human achievement. The integrity of both religion and science is respected; their proper limitations are acknowledged; and their often puzzling relationships examined for praxis, or practical meaning, in the quest for better living and common human hope.

In this dialectical interaction, the man or woman of faith is not required to dilute, distort or abandon that faith and the knowledge which informs it. Belief in the one God of infinite, creative power and love, who is the source of all being, is sustained. So are the unique qualities of human kind which derive from divine creation: self-consciousness, intelligence and freedom of choice and action. And Christians keep standing on the reality of Jesus Christ, in and by whom God offers the power to use intelligence and freedom to experience the amplitude of human existence. One use of intelligence is to comprehend some essentials, at least, of the natural, social and life sciences; even as the same power of perception and reason is used to grasp the meaning of the Bible, the Gospel and theology as guides to daily experience.

A Christian thinker who has pondered and affirmed this dialectical interaction is Thomas F. Torrance of Edinburgh. 'There are not two ways of knowing, a scientific way and a theological way,' he writes. 'Neither science nor theology is an esoteric way of knowledge. Indeed, because there is only one basic way of knowing, we cannot contrast science and theology, but only natural science and *theological* science, or social science and *theological* science. In each we have to do with a fundamental act of knowing...'²

There is a valid sense, Torrance is saying, in which the knowledge we possess and gain about God and the divine will for creation is as much a scientifically gained knowledge as is the knowledge of magnetic fields, chemical reactions, or the migratory habits of birds. Thus, all knowledge can rightly be

called scientific, including the knowledge which arises from faith in God. So far as the *objects* of knowledge are concerned, they are potentially the same for all perceiving people; namely, everything there is. But particular sciences deal with particular kinds of things in limited fields. An electronics engineer cannot do research on genetics, nor a sociologist on high-energy physics.

So far as the *means* of acquiring and using knowledge go, they also vary widely according to the many fields of inquiry. So a pharmacologist has little use for a radio-telescope as large as a football field. And a bio-physicist does not need in research the data of theological sciences, such as the tradition, literature and reports of human encounter with God. Yet, there is basically but one entity which not only knows but knows that it knows: and that is the most remarkable thing in the universe, the human mind. Here is where the quest for knowledge leads to a most daring and difficult frontier. It challenges the physiological and behavioral scientists as well as the philosophers and theologians. It is the frontier of the mind itself. How does the brain function in relation to thinking, imagining, remembering, deciding, aspiring, praying? What is mind? Reasonable faith and the empirical and theoretical sciences are in a dialectical interaction because neither has yet solved the problem of how the mind knows with some certainty of what is true. Whenever that primal problem of philosophy is resolved, of course, the tensions of science and faith will be dissolved.

Meanwhile it is incumbent upon thoughtful religious persons who live necessarily in a culture of science-based technology to keep assessing the perils and promises of this wondrous phenomenon. Better to do so, they might discern four main characteristics of science and technology in the world's industrializing, industrialized and (soon) post-industrial nations. For convenience in this discussion, the one word 'science' is used to include the theoretical, experimental and social sciences as well as their application in technique and technology. These four are:

1. The *pervasiveness* in our societies of the whole scientific enterprise.

2. The irresistible *momentum* and accelerated *speed* of discovery and application as well as of human adaptability to changes.

3. The *self-transfiguration* of humanity itself by self-directed evolution in a manipulated environment.

4. The *paradox* of threat and promise to the wellbeing of 'all people who on earth do dwell,' consequent upon either ignorance and sin, on one hand, or wisdom and good will, on the other. These considerations may tell something of both the conflicts and common hopes of people whose primary allegiance is either to science or to religious faith.

1. The wide pervasiveness of the scientific-technological system is a new feature of late twentieth century civilization. It is omnipresent, almost in the way the Hebrew Psalmist's song of God's presence: 'If I take the wings of the morning (that is, an early flight on a DC-10) and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea (180° around the globe), behold thou art there.' The mechanized empires of Dupont, Volkswagen, Phillips, Mitsubishi and ITT are everywhere. This pervasiveness is not only world-wide in extent. It permeates intensively the daily life of most people.

It is wise, however, to distinguish between two kinds of technology which exist concurrently and overlap a bit. One is called *inventive* technology. It has been effective for many centuries and raises few problems for justice, peace or good life. The other is *science-based* technology, which is a new phenomenon; and it presents numerous problems.

(a) Inventive technology began when some of the early specimens of our race experienced that most wonderful abstraction: an idea. Emerging from his cave one morning, some unknown ancestor saw a round, flat stone—and an idea was born. But the wheel was of no use until another ancestor had another idea: the axle. And there was the fore-runner of the ox cart, stage coach and Mercedes-Benz. Throughout history the ordinary, practical imagination has been adding to the human pile of invented tools, devices and gadgets. These continue to multiply.

(b) Science-based technology also requires imagination, but much more in addition. A prodigious body of scientific knowledge is required of researchers and technicians. Not only must the inventor have mastery of a number of specialized fields of science but must usually be committed to teamwork. The solitary researcher is a rarity today.

What has caused the revolution from simple experimenting to the organized work of sometimes hundreds of scientists? It has utterly transformed work in chemistry, metallurgy, agronomy, electricity, electronics, biology, microbiology, and the rest.

The change agents have been three in particular: all of them *big*. Big business, big universities, and big government. All are devoted to high-level research and development under high pressure for either profits or national interest. Invested capital, efficient manufacturing and expedited marketing have made possible the flowing rivers of technologically produced goods for consumers. Unhappily, the world's military machines absorb the skills and labours of nearly one-half of all scientists, while spending just now some four hundred billion U.S. dollars per annum on military purposes.

Despite the attractiveness of the slogan, 'small is beautiful,' in a world of dwindling resources, the powers of business, academic science and militarized governments behold beauty in what is big. If knowledge is power, then scientific and technical knowledge is the highest power. Except for some few who flee to the forests to find a simple life, we are inextricably dependent upon the research, development and distribution of this comprehensive complex of conglomerates: science, commerce and government.

2. The irresistible momentum and accelerating speed of science are its second characteristic. More and more processes and products appear at a faster and faster rate of change. The artifacts of only fifty or forty years ago now repose in museums. How quaint, how cumbersome, how inefficient seem those devices and machines of the past generation! (And, one could add, how sturdily built in comparison to the planned obsolescence of recent articles!)

Not only are technical products obsolescent; so are scientific theories. Such seemingly fundamental understandings as those of matter, atomic structure, properties of light, genes, viruses and the universe are being revised. Sudden breaks with the past theories, quantum leaps to new ones, to new models and methods are now the expected modes of scientific advance.

Science has thus assumed an autonomous identity and existence. With a few exceptions, the central dogma seems to be: what *should* be done *can* be done; what *can* be done *will* be done. And very soon!

How well are citizens of highly industrialized nations adapting to these rapid changes? Possibly too well. Psychological and social disruptions are plentifully evident as we are projected into each new era. The eras literally *new*, unprecedented. Those who are at least thirty-five years of age have already lived through the explosive beginnings of four new eras. They mark the end of the industrial era in highly developed societies.³ All began in the decade following the World War, that is, since 1945. They are:

- The atomic or nuclear era, 1945
- The cybernetic or computerized era, 1948
- The microbiological or genetic era, 1953
- The space-travel era, 1959.

History provides no parallels to these sudden eruptions of knowledge or their rapid transformation of ways of living for hundreds of millions of people.

3. The effect of science is the self-transfiguration of the human race.⁴ This term, again, is used literally, not metaphorically. As many have explained, thanks to scientific technology as the practical extension of our brains and bodies, we are directing our own evolution. Not only our ways of living, but the self-identity of men, women and children are changing shape through the effects of science. In what sense? In two main spheres: technosphere and biosphere.

The new technosphere is the man-made environment. It is human ecology, made by changing or adding to what nature provides. It is true that human beings have always shaped their environment; but the new dimension, due to science, is the broadened scope and accelerated speed of environmental change. From simply tilling the soil and damming streams and building cities of habitation, humanity is now changing the very face of the earth. Let every valley be exalted by housing developments, industrial parks and dumps of waste, and every mountain of minerals and every hill of forests be laid low! Make straight in the desert an endless cement freeway for our lord, the automobile!

Or fly over any continent and see what wonders—and horrors—have been wrought. The earth is our technosphere. And by science, for better or worse, we are transfiguring it.

Is it different with the human biosphere? A common saying is, 'People are always the same.' Is that true? No longer. It is not true with respect to physical stature, longevity, or even mentality.

In the favoured countries of the Northern Hemisphere, the sciences of agriculture, nutrition and medicine have changed within a century the average height of men and women by an increase of two inches.

With the reduction of infant mortality and the restriction or elimination of lethal diseases, both by preventive measures and therapeutic means, expected longevity in these countries is rising rapidly from seventy years to seventy-five and soon to eighty. Comparable increments, though within fewer years of age, are seen in many lands of the Southern Hemisphere.

People are not always the same. Where science has brought rapid social change, the very ways of thinking and speaking are vastly different from those of their grandparents.

Science is taking humanity, furthermore, beyond these changes. It is transforming modes of procreation today, and

tomorrow may change our bodies and persons by genetic interventions.

Until about 1950, and thus for all times past, people have generally accepted the inevitable patterns of living and dying. The natural mating of woman and man could not be dissociated from procreation children. Many women bore prodigious numbers of infants, a large proportion of which were buried beneath pathetic little gravestones or otherwise disposed of. There was little understanding of the disabling genetic diseases. Efforts to ward off epidemic diseases were futile.

It is typical of the present time, when scientific technology has helped to expand public and commercial bureaucracies, that the technical word 'management' has been appropriated for medicine, the life sciences, birth and death. Pre-natal conditions of women and unborn children are scientifically managed. Even the activity of male-female coupling can be managed: so sexual union can be enjoyed without babies, and babies can be produced without sexual union. 'Let nature take its course' has become an obsolete counsel. Now the course of nature for human life can be managed scientifically.

Few developments in the area of the human biosphere have imposed upon the public conscience such terribly ambiguous and controversial problems as those affecting procreation, genetic manipulation and death. We are glad to have the health and longevity of our bodies improved. But now we have been thrust by the applied sciences into the role of umpires in the game of human life itself. Decisions have to be made about pre-natal diagnosis of genetic aberrations following amniocentesis or sonography; about male or female sex determination; about artificial insemination by anonymous men; about *in vitro* fertilization with embryo transfer to the proper mother; about surrogate mothers for hire; about deliberate infanticide of so-called 'defective' babies. Predetermined categorical decisions, whether permissive or prohibitive as one's convictions might dictate, can never satisfy every such difficult case. Caution and discretion, exercised in the light of the criterion of the incalculable value of each human

life, and considered with reference to all persons concerned, are indispensable. Where nature once took its course, science has now created problems which require responsible human decision-making. But interpreters of religious beliefs and ethics are notoriously divided on counselling how to decide.

Yet all appeal to a general respect for every human life. It is not the life of a kitten or a spring lamb or a laboratory mouse which is at stake. With few exceptions, humanistic morality agrees with religious ethics about the sanctity of life; but the latter attaches a transcendent value, because human life is seen as God's prime gift and concern. As often emphasized, God loans us our lives for his purpose of love.⁶ And if, by reason of science we have learned to manage each living loan, we are enjoined to exercise our management skills with utmost regard for life's value. So there is nothing in principle wrong with the self-transfiguration of humanity person by persons. Possibly this is what God the Creator expects of us. But with great care for the power at our disposal.

4. The paradoxical simultaneity of threat and promise is the fourth aspect of scientific technology. If it were only a matter of our intention we might speak only of the promise and avoid the threats. Presumably most people who exercise power over the deployment of scientific resources and technical methods do their jobs with the best intention for human welfare. However, the pernicious evils of undue self-interest and the thirst for power, which corrupt people's good intentions, should not be underestimated.

More serious than malice and more widespread than evil intent is ignorance. It is because of the fault of ignorance that the hopeful promises of science-based technology degenerate into the risks of threatening evil and destruction. There are two kinds of ignorance, though. One is corrigible; the other unavoidable. The first is just our not-knowing or not-understanding the science and technology which we are using—and which in a way are using *us* and manipulating our lives. The correction of this ignorance, obviously, is education. But

late estimates of the condition of science education in the United States are most pessimistic. The level of science education in secondary schools has slipped back to the pre-Sputnik era of the nineteen-fifties.⁶

The second type of ignorance is no one's fault. Even the wisest scientists are ignorant of unforeseeable consequences of their research and application.

The ignorance which can be corrected by education is two-sided. On one side is the ignorance of the non-scientists, the public, the so-called laymen. But the other side of ignorance is chargeable to many scientists. Those who do research and apply their knowledge to production are often inexcusably uninformed about those spheres of knowledge and experience which are directly affected by science. Particular deficiencies are noted in respect to the social sciences and humanities: economic and political dynamics in the whole world's societies; justice and equity for the two-thirds of humanity who are poor, oppressed and struggling for liberation; also moral philosophy and religion. A glaring fault of the professional enterprise of science is that many of its practitioners are kept in ignorance of the problems of people and nations which their very research is serving to exacerbate.

More threatening still is the ignorance about scientific matters on the part of persons who set public policies, enact laws and implement them. Decisions have to be made about new drugs, food additives, support as well as control of research in recombinant DNA, toxic waste and acid rain, pesticides, chemical and biological weapons, nuclear energy and nuclear weapons. The safety and well-being of nations are entrusted to persons who often possess minimal knowledge of the sciences involved in all these great issues. They seek the advice of experts; and governments have offices of technology assessment. Still, the situation of grave risk remains precarious.

Where does Christian faith engage the problems of the uses and abuses, the hopes and threats, of science today? The answer clearly does not lie in attempting to force selected biblical phrases or traditional doctrinal formulae upon this

pervasive and perplexing phenomenon. While scientific technology leaps ahead, shooting off dazzling sparks of prodigious achievement, it confronts thoughtful Christians with unprecedented demands for interpretation and evaluation.

Prayers may be in order. They always are. But never without responsible thought and action as well.

Just as differing cultures and economic societies require what is called 'appropriate technology' so Christian faith now needs 'appropriate theology,' for the present and, even more, for the coming years. Some lineaments of such an appropriate theology may only be sketched here. On the pattern of action and reflection in reference to the actual contexts of human living, there are for Christian faith both the exterior-active responses and the interior-reflective ones.

The active are three in number, at least:

(a) Declaring by any means of expression and communication the prophetic word against corrupt and corrupting uses of scientific technology;

(b) Knowing how to use opportunities to engage scientists and policy-makers in directing science toward human benefit and peace.

(c) Using democratic, participatory power of the ballot, as well as economic leverage where feasible, to defend the good green earth and all its inhabitants from exploitation and harm.

The interior, reflective responses are also three:

(a) Doxology to God the Creator and Preserver of all for such works of human intelligence and freedom of mind which the achievements of science exhibit.

(b) Pondering the value and meaning of each human life in its relation to the cosmic Creator, and in view of scientific studies of human origins, genetic causation, and the formative influence of various environments.

(c) Reflecting on the possibilities and hopes for our increasingly self-directed evolution by the scientific ordering of the technosphere and the biosphere.

The ancient Psalmist asked God the poignant question, 'What is man that Thou art mindful of him?'

Our question to the same God today might be, 'Who are we, and who are we becoming, in this finite world, which You, the infinite God, have given us?'

NOTES

1. The concept of dialectical interaction is discussed along with other possible relation as between faith and science in my own book, *Science and Our Troubled Conscience* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980). See also the report of the World Council of Churches' Conference of 1979, *Faith and Science in an Unjust World*, edited by Paul Abrecht (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980) pp. 14-16.
2. Thomas F. Torrance, *God and Rationality* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971) p. 91.
3. The radical newness of the post-industrial culture is graphically described by Alvin Toffler, *The Third Wave* (New York: William Morrow, 1980) and by many scientific books and journals.
4. Victor C. Ferkise, *Technological Man* (New York: New American Library, 1969) p. 28.
5. The concept of human life as a loan from the Creator rather than a gift without conditions is cogently presented by Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, Vol. III, Part 4 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1961) pages 327ff.
6. See *Faith and Science in an Unjust World*, 2, edited by Paul Abrecht, pp. 39-48.
7. Psalm 8:4.

3. DISARMAMENT AS PRELUDE TO BUILDING A WORLD COMMUNITY OF PEACE AND JUSTICE

BISHOP DR. KAROLY TOTH

It gives me great pleasure as a Church leader of one of the churches in the socialist countries to warmly greet *Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios*. We highly value his contribution to ecumenical dialogue, his participation in the Christian Peace Conference and his expertise on questions of justice, liberation and development which are concerns of high priority in today's world.

In tackling the subject, we can view it in its negative and positive aspects in a dialectical fashion. The subject can then be reformulated as the danger of the escalating arms race as the main factor of the division of mankind which creates an obstacle to peace and justice. Of course, if we are to follow the same idea in a positive sense, the disarmament is the inescapable key factor in the understanding of world community.

In the modern era, world community is a fundamental premise. We live in a technologically developed world in which we are interconnected by quick travel, easy communication and express connections. Humankind belongs together, distances have evaporated and no secrets within or among nations is any more possible. But the tragic fact is that this very unity of humankind can prove a danger due to the unbridled arms race. For this unity can become the united death of humankind through a nuclear holocaust. The planet on which we live can become a united mass grave of humankind condemned to a nuclear death.

Speaking as a Christian in a country ruled by a Marxist party, I would consider it to be the imperative and highest duty of the Church to do all that is in her power by word and action to save humankind from such a nuclear catastrophe. This service cannot be delayed, but rather all the resources available

need to be mobilized for the survival of humankind. When the Church is in the vanguard of this struggle for survival and battle to stop the arms race, she will certainly be highly esteemed and be credible.

Let us move on to consider how Europe has not experienced a major conflagration since the Second World War. The theory is often propounded that peace in Europe was possible because of the balance of terror. This is a view which is widely held and quite comfortably and often thoughtlessly accepted and worse the reason for lack of war in Europe easily explained away. But a careful examination of facts and with the findings of scholars and politicians who have penetrated deep into the issue, it can be stated that absence of war in Europe was not due to the balance of terror, not due to rockets and other sophisticated weapons. The great powers tacitly accepted the result of the Second World War, i.e., the division of Europe into two parts. While the great powers settled to this solution, the political and ideological tensions of Europe moved into the Third World. It was inevitable that this transference of tension to the Third World countries by an escalation of arms sale and fuelling local conflicts created a deplorable situation for the Third World countries.

As for the so-called balance of terror, it was proved to be a two-fold failure, by igniting the arms race to increase the danger and by effectively exposing the fact that peace cannot be based on mutual fear, distrust and threat.

In the process of disarmament, two tasks are imperative. In the first place to de-escalate the arms build up, we have to jettison the traditional concept of security. Security founded on fear and terror—that is on military might—has no basis at all today for security, for one would only be a threat to the other. Here it is that all those who are committed to stopping the arms race should work out an alternate security concept in the broadest possible terms, for security to be viable in the present world context, it has to be decidedly a collective security. As Robert S. McNamara, former president of the World Bank stated in one of his addresses: '...if one reflects on the problem more deeply it is clear that force alone does not

guarantee security, and that a nation can reach a point at which it does not buy more security for itself simply by buying more military hardware.' ('Development and the Arms Race,' in *Church and Society*, Vol. LXXI No. 2-3, New York, 1981).

Internal social security and military security are contradicting each other. Social security of every single nation can only be attained by international co-operation and not by competition in the arms race.

Secondly, one of the greatest obstacles to liberation, justice and development in the Third World is the escalating arms race. The arms race eats into the vitals of the world's economy calling a halt to any possibility of the developed nations to aid those countries which are desperately in want. Hunger, misery and death stalk over 800 million of the world's population counting over 160,000 who perish every twenty-four hours. But no assistance can reach these beleaguered countries, for the arms industry gorges with a gargantuan appetite the wealth of this planet. Such is the grim record of the arms race which swallows US \$ 500 billion each year. Further, this uncontrolled escalation creates galloping inflation and unimaginable insecurity in the whole world.

Many still wrongly argue that disarmament has no relation to liberation, that they are two distinct areas which must be separately treated. It is vital to dispel this false understanding between disarmament and liberation. The fight for disarmament and the struggle for liberation are complementary. It is no lie that those who arm, are those who are the least interested in liberation. The greatest enemies of disarmament are those who oppose the liberation process in areas of the world, where such struggles are still going on.

We have also to recognize that the development of better relations between East and West in Europe is in every way advantageous to the countries of the Third World. But the present trend of deterioration of relations prevents the developed countries to do less and less to help development, which is not only detrimental to the Third World, but also causes a global impact.

The policy of the present US administration sets up another obstacle to real disarmament. To put it boldly, it is an oversimplified view of the so called 'disorder' in the world. Wherever trouble-makers are found, which means people who do not agree with and fall in line with the US policy pattern, they are termed Marxists and Communists. Such a situation will inevitably call for a more massive arms build up with quick transportation to the trouble spot to put out the flame of liberation. Such a view is not only politically naive but is far removed from any sober understanding of the logic of history. Of course, in areas which are riddled with poverty, injustice and exploitation, Marxists can be thrown up as liberators. Their presence is a positive sign of the actuality of the dreadful evils of oppression and injustice.

It is with declarations and actions in this strain that the US administration has effected the greatest arms budget in peace time. This has come to be through echoing the chorus of anti-Americanism and pro-Sovietism. 'People who are anti-American are necessarily in the category of pro-Soviets,' is the theme. But examined critically this slogan carries with it a tremendous fallacy, for turning marxist does not necessarily mean being anti-American. So it is with countries as Zimbabwe, Nicaragua and now El Salvador. The lesson has to be learnt and this chiefly by the present US administration that a country can become anti-American, not by the simple rule of being drawn into the Soviet camp, but because of the failure of American policy.

This in-depth analysis leaves us with no option but to set ourselves with all the determination that we can muster to the most urgent task of avoiding a world war which would in its wake bring unthinkable and unspeakable global catastrophe.

It is not, therefore, a surprise that millions and millions inhabiting the planet, threatened with planetary nuclear catastrophe, are taking action that this generation and the ones to come may live in safety.

Several questions trouble the minds of the people in Europe. Is Europe to be the greatest centre of danger? Is Europe to

be the site of the limited and successful nuclear war? Is Europe to be the continent where the neutron bomb is most likely to be used? The situation has given rise to protest demonstrations in Bonn, Rome, Amsterdam, London, Brussels, Paris, Athens, Lisbon, in many cities in Finland and many other countries. People have assembled and marched from the most diverse social and political backgrounds—Christian Democrats, Socialists, Communists, Liberals, Radicals, Nationalists, Christian church-members and representatives of different church groups—Protestant and Catholic alike—, people, who belong to no party, ordinary men and women, factory and farm workers, housewives, students, unemployed persons, artists, writers, scientists, physicians etc. The question can well be asked as to whether these people who are marching are 'misled' or 'alarmist' or 'one-sided'. It is clear that they belong to none of these descriptions. Millions are taking to the streets as this is the only option left. The demonstrations reveal that the people's power has never been greater. But because of the unprecedented terrible peril of a nuclear war, the peace movement has yet to grow much larger, much more powerful, much more united, increasingly embracing the widest ranging forces if it is to be successful in putting an end to the threat of nuclear war. People have the power to do this and they certainly intend to use this power.

Vital also is the need of this hour to gain a right analysis of historical events. Lipping the well worn propaganda that the guilt for the arms race must be laid squarely on the shoulders of both capitalists and socialists is decidedly bereft of understanding and accurate critical analysis. It is well known and should be restated that the capitalist countries amass arms mainly and in a great measure on the basis of economic interest which bring massive returns in profit for the arms merchants. The military industrial complex makes possible huge investment with quick and enormous returns.

The arms production in socialist countries falls into a completely different category. No one in the socialist countries profits from arms, but they cannot be inactive in a situation of danger and are thus compelled to catch-up with the capitalist countries in maintaining a level. Of course, all this

waste of expenditure on arms in socialist lands are drawn from the nations' wealth which could be better channelled for the essential development of the economies and general well-being of the people. It is, no doubt, an enormous and a well-nigh unbearable burden on the socialist countries.

The war-mongers use this situation to compel the escalation of arms in socialist countries till they face death. They themselves set no limit to the manufacture, stockpiling and testing of the most sophisticated nuclear weaponry. The entire build-up proceeds with the projection of the 'first-strike capability' which will paralyze the enemy to a state of impotence where there can be no strike-back.

Added to this is the concept of a 'limited' nuclear war which—as some theorists say—can be waged and won within a calculated area. The situation becomes disastrous when the US attempts to position medium range nuclear missiles and Pershing IIs in Western European countries thus making these lands vulnerable to a nuclear outbreak. It further aggravates the fear as to whether the scene of the limited nuclear war will be the countries of Western Europe.

We cannot pass without firmly stating that the 'first-strike' capability and the 'limited' nuclear war concepts are illusions with practically no reality. Armed to the teeth as the nations are today and with the enormous war technology, the know-how that the nation possess, it borders on the absurd to talk of striking first and getting away with it. Further, to speak of a nuclear war to which bounds can be set seems preposterous. Nuclear war is a fire which no power can stop. Hiroshima and Nagasaki proved it in a minor key, but today's stockpiled nuclear weaponry contains million times more kill-power than the atom bomb used on Hiroshima.

The Church's Task

World community can only be realized in peace and justice. The pre-requisite for the continuing existence of the human race is to reduce arms, stop the arms race. Too long has it been

left to politicians to call an end to destructive killer weaponry. Events show that they have not succeeded and the future bears no prospect either of the politicians' success.

Here it is that the Christian churches have to play an important and positive role. The Churches have to raise a critical united world opinion. The voice of the Churches, if raised unitedly and unequivocally, can prove a powerful force in quelling the arms race. This voice, to be effective, must be a voice of ecumenical co-operation. There is at least a sign that the Churches are increasingly discovering the tasks of peace and justice. The start the Churches have made in this direction is sure to bring fruitful results.

Accent on Development

There is increasing conviction that a close connection exists between liberation and disarmament. The word 'peace' is known by different names in different parts of the world. On the European scene, in the East and West, peace is the complete stoppage of the arms race. But in the Third World, peace is liberation and development. In the wake of the escalating arms race and the immense resources spent on arms by the North countries, the North-South relations stand blocked. Negotiations, agreements, assistance and other relations cannot take off the ground because the concentration of the developed countries is nowhere but on arms.

In this context, one can judge that the entire global economy is rapidly changing with an increase by Japan and Asia and a decreasing process in Western Europe and North America. So rapidly changing is the situation that the President of the World Bank in his analysis has stated that the North-South division is inadequate in computing the deals and calculations, and has suggested dividing the world into eight sections from the economic point of view. They are: 1) West Europe, 2) North America, 3) Japan, 4) Socialist countries of East Europe, 5) South America and South East Asia, 6) Organization of Petroleum Exporting countries; 7) India, China, Pakistan and Indonesia; 8) The least developed, the poorest countries: the Fourth World. (A. W. Clausen, 'Le

schème Nord-Sud dépassé', in *Jeune Afrique Economie*, 1982 (Fevrier).

Of course, we have to recognize that in the summons for the development of the Third World countries several approaches have been made. The meeting at Cancun revealed rigidity on the part of the Western industrialized countries led by the US. They called for the operation of the classical capitalist pattern in terms of the free market economy.

The Group 77 elaborated the New International Economic Order which the United Nations discussed and approved in the Sixth and Seventh Special Sessions.

The socialist countries hold that without internal social justice there cannot be international social justice. But whatever the projection for developments the momentum is halted because the arms race is 'enemy number one' of development. No negotiations can move ahead unless a favourable international atmosphere is being created, that is the experience of the Non-Aligned Nations themselves.

Towards World Community

In spite of such a situation, humankind is not entirely hopeless. The hope for world community is the UN which now numbers a forum of 155 nations. It could be well said that the United Nations presents world community in a microcosm. It can, if rightly nurtured, be the take off point for world community.

With 155 nations, the UN presents the most universal representation of humankind. The UN is not only the total sum of the nations represented in it, but the entire fabric of the UN has a political, moral and psychological impact on each of these nations. (Maurice Bertrand, 'La crédibilité des Nations Unies' in *Le Monde*, 12-15 Janvier, 1982).

The UN consists not only of political organs but also has its agencies in the social (FAO), cultural (UNESCO) and humanitarian (UNICEF) fields. It has also at its centre economic and monetary concerns as UNCTAD, IMF and World Bank. The

UN operates in a network of intergovernmental organizations as the OAU, OAS, COMECON, EEC and besides these are the NGOs which have a global embrace. In order to receive a complete picture of the broad based stance and operation of the UN, we must need to view all these facts together as one whole.

The expense of maintaining the UN comes nowhere in comparison with the vast sums spent on arms and the global military machine. It is estimated that the functioning of the political organs in one year costs less than half of the money spend one day on arms. According to SIPRI, the nations of the world spent \$ 500 billions on arms a year. This would mean that arms cost \$ 1½ billion per day. On such a calculation the functioning of the political organs of the UN would cost only a ½ of \$ 1½ billion. This example is sufficient to prove how much less the administration of the UN costs in comparison with the extremely costly arms race.

Factors of Promise

The right to National independence and the right to development are moral principles which rank high in the agenda of the United Nations. These principles, though commonly accepted, are set in high gear by the UN, and her agencies.

Such moral principles combined with a far flung information network are of immense strength for millions in search of national independence and development. Further, strength is provided by the UN in condemning in no uncertain terms those who violate basic moral principles. It, therefore, behoves all nations to strengthen the structure of this pattern of world community so that it will contribute to build moral pressure on the nations of the world.

We know Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios as one who cherishes the idea of world community. In this unceasing quest he believes that the unity of the Churches will be promoted by their service to the growth of world community. Further,

Metropolitan Mar Gregorios maintains that the divisive factors of the arms race, racism and apartheid, exploitation and oppression when steadily opposed will create an opposition in unity in the Churches. It is the urgent task of the Churches to move ahead with optimism and hope to build a world community grounded on the principles clearly enunciated in the Gospel.

4. A SPIRITUALITY FOR COMBAT

Dr. M. M. THOMAS

In any discussion about building human community in the modern world, it is impossible to avoid the ethics of struggle, conflict, combat and violence. It is easy to recognise conflict as a fact of social life. But how far can it be considered a means of social transformation and reconstruction? If conflict has a legitimate place in social ethics, can the Christian faith provide a 'spirituality to sustain people in such combat within the context of its ultimate spirituality of *Koinonia*'. It is this question, that is raised by the phrase 'spirituality for combat'.

Religions of the Indian mystic tradition, especially Hinduism and Buddhism, consider the historical-social life of mankind as itself an alienation from the ultimate being or non-being, so that spiritual self-realisation is only for the individual, and that too as liberation from involvement in the historical. Even in the religions of the prophetic type like Judaism, Christianity and Islam, there is a great deal of spirituality conceived in the same way. But where it is not an effort to absorb the mystic experience into the prophetic, it is a deviation from the central emphasis in these religions.

Speaking of Christianity, in it there is a strong tradition of looking at Christian life as spiritual warfare. The cross of Jesus Christ is for St. Paul the locus of God's decisive victory in this struggle against evil forces (Col. 2:15); and the Resurrection of Christ is the 'first fruit' of that victory in the world. The warfare continues till all powers are brought under the feet of Christ and God shall be all and in all (1 Cor. 15. 20-28). Meanwhile Christians have to put on the whole armour of God to fight against Satan and his spiritual hosts of darkness still operating in the world (Eph. 6:10-17). Both St. Paul and the Seer in their forecast of the future see an imminent strengthening of the power of the Anti-Christ in the world just before the consummation of the victory of Christ (2 Thess. 2:3-8; Rev. 20:1-4).

Martin Luther used to say that the Christian warfare was against sin, death and the devil. But very often in the history of the Christian Church, it has been interpreted or practised individualistically, as spiritual struggle of the individual against evil in his soul. This is no doubt inherent in the Gospel warfare, but only partially. The expressions of sin, death and the devil in structures of social history have not been given their due in many of the traditions of Christian spirituality. This is true whether one looks at the spirituality of *theosis* in Orthodoxy, of mysticism in Catholicism, Pietism in Evangelicalism or the more recent Charismatic movement. Bultman's existential theology even denies that in the New Testament the Gospel has anything to do with the 'nations' as in the Old Testament, and converts Christian spirituality into a purely inward experience of new self-understanding without any meaningful relation to the structures of society, or power-political forces of history. In all such spiritualities and the theologies underlying them, the *Koinonia* of the Church is conceived only as a reconciliation between individuals who have been separately reconciled to God through Christ.

This, no doubt, protects the truth that personal reconciliation with God is essential and that the communion of love in the world is God's gift. But the atomic character of the human being and the one-dimensional character of God's action in history make these theologies questionable. It is heartening to observe that as result of the impact of ecumenism, Christian theologies and spiritualities are undergoing a process of renewal absorbing the spiritual significance of corporate life and recognising the Divine presence in the power-political realm.

Two insights have been increasingly accepted as integral to Christian spirituality. One: that the *Koinonia* of Spirit manifested centrally in the Eucharist and spilling over into the liturgical life after the liturgy, is not merely a co-existence of atomised individuals but a communion of persons in organic interaction with the historical dialectics of nature and society. Two: that God's action in history must be seen in three distinctive but related modes of continuous Creation, continuous

Judgement and continuous Redemption, all three being directed to and fulfilled in the consummation of the Kingdom of God and His Christ at the end of history.

Many competent theologians including Paulos Mar Gregorios have attempted to place these insights within the framework of the traditional Trinitarian concept of God. From the angle of the Ethics of Modernity, Nicolas Berdyaev's three-fold Ethics—of Creativity, Law and Grace—as responses to God's three-fold action of creation, judgement and redemption in history, may be an adequate starting point. Of course all God's actions in history are directed to the New Man Jesus Christ by the Spirit; therefore the Ethic of Grace is the ultimate goal and criterion of the Ethics of creativity and the Ethics of law.

In all three modes of Divine action, power is a constituent element. Continuous Creation means the enhancement of spiritual freedom of human selfhood and of its creative power. As that freedom rebels against its finiteness and seeks to become infinite (Gen 3), human creativity turns demonic (Gen 4). In this situation God's judgements seek to protect humanity from being destroyed by the flood of sin by checking corruption of power by ordaining powers of Law and retribution (Rom : 13). But this itself is only a preparation for the ultimate redemption of the world through the total exposure of God to rebellious humanity on the cross and victory over it; a redemption through which power is once again related to self-giving and forgiving love in communion and community.

The modern world is the result of a tremendous upsurge of human creativity. It has enlarged human freedom and increased human power through scientific pursuit of truth, technological mastery of nature and society and through a series of organised social revolutions. This has led many to reject the traditional doctrines of creation as they were conceived in terms of static order and not dynamic change. But in more recent times, scientists and technologists have been forced by their recognition of the destructive forces they have created to seek to place the spiritual vision behind science and technology within the framework of a larger vision (eg: at the M & T conference of

the WCC at Boston); they have been asking the Church for an adequate doctrine of creation which does justice to their vision and discipline it. This is a significant development. It is indeed time for theologians to see in the enlargement of Freedom and Power of the modern humanity, not a negation of any orders of creation but in a real sense, the fulfilment of the promise in creation, a new stage in the creation of the world and a development of the potential of the image of God in human beings given in creation. Redemption itself is not a return of the First Adam to his lost paradise, but the creative movement towards the Second Adam whose humanity is a higher expression of God's purpose than that of the First (1 Cor. 15: 43-49).

Our concern in this essay flows from a positive affirmation of the enhanced Freedom and power of modern mankind. Every new stage in creation necessarily involves a new Fall. Hence the enhancement of modern destructivities. Here comes the importance of the second mode of God's action, namely that Judgement as a means of protecting humanity from being destroyed by the new destructive forces which the perversions of the new creative forces have produced. Here we are dealing with the constantly changing historical dialectics of power, law and justice. In a world of individual and collective self-seeking which corrupts power and makes for exploitation and oppression, God seeks to check monopolies of power not only by law with the sanction of coercive power, but also by the powers emerging outside the sanction of law as a result of inner contradictions. Not only structures of state with its 'Sword' but all collective powers with elemental sense of justice are ministers of God's judgement (Rom. 13: 4), until they themselves become oppressive and lose the mandate of heaven. Thus the ministers and ministries are constantly changing because instruments of God's judgement are themselves part of the fallen order and tend to become corrupt, destroying humanity rather than protecting it, and has to be replaced. In this realm, God uses power-politics to maintain a relative measure of justice.

The Two Kingdoms doctrine of Lutheranism of course separates this realm of law and justice absolutely from the realm of

grace. And the Barthian protest against it in the name of Christ's sole ultimate authority for mankind in the Barmen Declaration is right. Also the protest of Reinhold Niebuhr's Christian Realism which insists that justice and Law must continually be redefined in the light of love and grace. They are right to point out that ultimately human justice is and must in some measure be a reflection of God's justification of human beings in Christ. For, the crucifixion of Jesus which is the ultimate exposure of God to human sin and judgement on sin is also the crucial point of the revelation of God's forgiveness and grace. The two realms therefore cannot be separated that absolutely. Therefore political justice should be evaluated in terms of the room it allows for the ethics of love and communion among people. Nevertheless it is quite utopian to think that the political realm can realise the *Koinonia* of the gospel. There will always remain a tension between necessary politics of justice and ultimate communion of love. Sometimes the tension becomes tragic, eg. in times of political revolutions and wars. But at other times, the tension could be kept more or less creative at all times liberating the movements of political justice from the spirit of self-righteous fury through a recognition of human solidarity in sin and Divine Forgiveness is an essential spiritual mission of the Church. However, no undue optimism is justified in politics—because till the end of history, where sin and death operate, the Kingdom of God comes into history only partially and only as first fruits. It will be fully manifest only at the end of time through the Last Judgement and Redemption.

In fact in the modern age of enhanced human powers, the unrealistic hope inherent in the liberal idea of evolutionary progress and the Marxist idea of dialectical progress that history is inevitably moving to some utopia, has had destructive results. By not being careful to put checks on concentrated centres of power, the easy optimism has led to unchecked corruption exploitation and oppression. Unchecked technological exploitation of the earth has led to destruction of the natural environment of life; unchecked technology has impersonalised society. Unchecked bureaucratic centralisation of power has created the one-party totalitarian state; unchecked militarisation has

brought about the threat of nuclear annihilation of the human race; unlimited *laissez-faire* industrialism has developed transnational corporations creating widespread global poverty and unemployment; unchecked revolutions have devoured their own children and have become sources of new oppression. Mostly it is the result of easy optimism and the utopian interpretation of human nature and human history.

In a world of sin and death it is necessary to see that centres of power are continuously made responsible through law, opposition and people's revolts and moral protests. In the realm of social and political power, as Ronald Preston has recently written, 'there is much cogency in the prayer which ends with the words, save us Lord by love, by prudence and by fear. God needs to use all the means at his command to weld recalcitrant humanity into tolerable existence and co-operation.' And the Christian ethic must be more than mere moral idealism; it should be a power-morals combination realistic enough to combat the power-ideology combinations behind oppressions but without self-righteous fury. Both the combat and its freedom from self-righteousness have their sanction in a spirituality with roots in the judging and forgiving activity of God. It serves individuals and people's liberation movements for combat against injustice and liberates them from the spirit of self-righteousness. This spirituality becomes real to the Christian people as they take seriously their participation in power-political movements for justice and their participation in the Eucharistic communion; that is, as they move between community involved in ideological political action and the community of forgiveness. In this way the Church may become the bearer, not only of the message of ultimate liberation of all things in Christ but also of a secular ethic of political struggle justified by faith.

It is in such a theological context that the Christian ecumenical movement has sought to define its concern for social justice in terms of Middle Axioms (Oxford 1937), the Responsible Society (Amsterdam 1948) and more recently the Just Participatory and Sustainable Society (Nairobi 1975). In all these criteria there are two elements which relate people's power to political struggles for justice.

First, there is justice understood as an *objective structure* where power and technology are controlled so that all people have the primary rights of living—food, clothing, shelter, education, health care and employment—and civil liberties for exercising personal and social responsibility in economic and social life. The question here is of dislodging the monopolies of power and distributing it to the victims of oppression. It has to be done through the organisation of people as objective power and engineering with class, caste and other forces. Which means people's power integrated in a revolutionary technology. But equally important is the second, namely people's participation. It involves the *subjective consciousness* of the people, to the awareness that they are subjects of their own destiny. Which means that the objective structures of justice should be the result, not just of a revolution technologically managed from the top, but a revolution which they themselves have waged, and the means and ends of which they themselves have, in large part, decided. Here the people's struggle for justice is seen aimed at establishing a state and society in which people's responsible participation is considered primary, and the technological and bureaucratic aspects only instrumental to it. Here it is important not merely to make the holders of economic and political power formally responsible to the representatives of the people however chosen, but to bring the people a large measure of 'direct' democracy, that is of participating in the day-to-day decision making processes which affect their welfare and dignity. Which means revolutionary technology integrated into people's self-awareness.

The relation between revolutionary engineering with people's forces and the people's conscious participation in the revolutionary struggle is not without its tensions. While Communism tends to emphasise the former, Democratic Socialism and Gandhism seek to emphasise the latter. But if any realistic politics is to combat oppression of monopoly power, whether of class, race, caste or nation, and realise people's free and responsible participation in the structures that emerge, this tension must be kept within the politics of combat. This tension is a reflection of the tension in collective life between power, laws, and love which is the foundation for any politics

of social humanism in our time. Christian spirituality is one that can live with that tension, even when it becomes tragic because it knows that it has only a transcendent resolution.

Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios in whose honour this volume is being published once wrote that the fundamental captivity of the modern world is that of a closed secular world, deprived of any valid symbols of hope or transcendence. The closed secular context is one in which idolatrous spiritualities abound in politics and ideologies of politics. And the question which the Church should ask is 'How can the struggles and conflicts to bring human dignity to the poor and the oppressed, even the power-politics which oppose institutionalised violence with counter violence, be kept within the spiritual framework of the ultimate power of the crucified Christ and the ultimate goal of reconciliation of all people in Christ'?

David Jenkins in his address on the theological enquiry on human rights was the first in ecumenical circles to ask for a spirituality for combat. He asked 'can our very struggles become part of our celebration of man as we understand him made in the image of God and died for by the son of God? How might we help one another to so conduct our struggle, that they become part of our worship?'

In the 1975 Nairobi Assembly of the World Council of Churches the concern found expression, not only in my address as Moderator but also in the Report of the Section on Human Development: 'Ambiguity of Power, Technology and Quality of Life'. The report said that in the search for a concept of Development as it is relaxed to a meaningful life, 'the churches have an opportunity to speak to mankind at large in their prophetic role supported by a Theology and Spirituality for combat.'

Metropolitan Mar Gregorios' whole life has been involved in defining this prophetic role of the global church in the global society. In this sphere he remains a pioneer of Christian ecumenism.

5. THEOLOGY OF UNITY IN ORTHODOX ECCLESIOLOGY

ARCHBISHOP KIRILL OF VYBORG, USSR

In answer to the appeal of friends and students of Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios, with great pleasure I am making my modest contribution to this Festschrift volume. I always remember numerous meetings and common activities with Vladyka Metropolitan. In his theological thinking I like his concentration on the concept of love as the loftiest reality.

Unworldly Love of the Trinity which reveals itself as real freedom in human community; its divine essence about which the Apostle of Love witnessed so simply and inspiringly (1 Jn. 4: 8); its gracefulness and necessity for man who bears the image of God and is called to bear the likeness of his Creator—these are invariable themes of the preaching of Christ's Church all along its historical existence. Our time, much more than ever before characterized by various confessional, social, racial and, eventually, personal divisions—makes us, ministers of the Church, constantly emphasize this theme of love in our preaching. In this aspiration I have been fully aware of my unanimity with Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios. This article is intended as a tiny part of those efforts, which the Orthodox Church always makes in its preaching of love.

From the very beginning of the historical existence of the Church, Orthodox ecclesiology has been based on two main dogmas—those of the Holy Trinity and of the Incarnation of the Son of God. St. John the Divine teaches: 'For there are three that bear record in heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one' (1 Jn. 5, 7). The Divine Trinity is a mode for the Church. Its Divine Founder appealed to his Father in Heaven when He prayed His high-priestly prayer: 'That they may all be one, even as Thou Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also

may be in us' (Jn. 17 : 21). Thus, Revelation shows us the essence of the Church as the realized love that is expressed in the unity of the multiplicity of persons forming the Church. Every person becomes the expresser of revealing itself in others and others in itself.

It was the Son of God's Incarnation that makes the Church a reality. 'And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us full of grace and truth' (Jn. 1 : 14)—these words, that are read in the Orthodox Church at Easter, proclaim the Church as a realization of the God-given destiny of humanity. The Divine Logos accepted a human body with a human soul and free will to make us the Body of the Church; that is why the Church is Christocentric in its nature. The Lord Jesus Christ is its base, its Divine Head. All members of the Body cling to Him in love and find their renewal in Him; this original teaching of the Church comes from the Lord Himself. He talked about Himself as 'bread out of heaven giving life to the world' (Jn. 6 : 27-58). He established the Holy Eucharist which becomes—at every given time and in every given place—a sacramental mystery of unity in love, where the Divine Head of the Church and her members are united. That is why a Fifteenth Century Church writer, Symeon, archbishop of Thessalonika calls the Eucharist 'a sacramental mystery of the Church'.

All the above mentioned considerations can help the reader to better understand why these teachings were at the centre of ardent discussions among the Orthodox Church and different heretics in the first centuries of Church history and at the ecumenical councils. Fighting with the heretics, the Church was fighting to save its own inner essence.

Already St. John the Divine at the beginning of the pagan reaction to Christianity in the form of false knowledge (gnosis), condemned those who rejected the reality of God the Son's incarnation as 'anti-Christ' (1 Jn. : 4, 3). John's follower, St. Irenaeus of Lyon (+202) who was struggling with docetism, expressed the necessity for every church member to believe in the Incarnation in the following very short and very richly packed words: 'The Son of the Almighty became the Son of Man

in order that every man would become Son of God'. This idea in its different variants was repeated many times in patristic literature later, because it was a brilliant expression of the Orthodox understanding of the Church as God-Man organism.

The rejection of this basic principle by all types of Arians led to dramatic discussions which continued into the fourth century when the dogma of the equality of the three Hypostases of the Trinity was proclaimed as equally binding for all members of the Universal Church. The Christological discussion also had a great significance for the understanding of the teaching of the Church. Through much suffering the Church achieved clarification of the teaching about the Incarnation—Godhead in true Manhood mysteriously united in the hypostasis of God the Son. This gave an impulse to further development of the Church's self-understanding. The last inseparable link in this development was the Seventh Council (787 A. D.) which confirmed the reverence of icons as the true teaching of the Church. This was a new witness to the reality of the Incarnation, to real acceptance of the human essence by the Son of God, to real human history that became the history of His Church. The dogmatic base for the Orthodox conception of the Church was thus laid.

We would understand it better if we take into consideration the exegesis of the Johanne Prologue by early Christian teachers. St. Jn. : 1 : 1-2 shows us the Divine Person's Unity in the Trinity and their being (*tropos eparxeōs*). The early fathers and teachers (Origen, John Chrysostom, Augustine, Cyril of Alexandria, John Scott, Theophylact) understood these verses as testifying to the eternal birth of God the Son, to His hypostatic dignity and to His equal essence with the Father. The same understanding of these verses we can find in St. Athanasius the Great, St. Basil the Great, St. Gregory the Theologian, and St. Gregory of Nyssa's works.

But the ecclesiological thought of the Church did not stop with the time of the Fathers; it was developing later and is developing till now. It is necessary to characterize the present state of Orthodox ecclesiology to clarify the place of Orthodoxy in our world. As we know, the Golden age of

Patristic literature was followed by a period of relative depression of theological thought, a depression which influenced the late Middle Ages and even the beginning of our modern period. This depression was created by scholastic methodology predominating in the West in the Middle Ages. The Reformation which started in the Sixteenth century brought no great new ideas in ecclesiology. The same depression was marked in Eastern theology too. We can, of course, note the hesychastic movement as a bright but last 'splash' of Greek patristic theology. The Eastern Empire fell due to various inside and outside factors, and after this fall the depression of theological thought in the East became acute. In Russia, which became the spiritual heiress of Byzantium, theology was only at the stage of formation. Though the Middle Ages gave us some glorious names such as Hilary, Metropolitan of Kiev (+ after 1051), Nil of Sora (+1508), Maxim the Greek (+1556), Sergius of Radonezh (+1592) and the latter's disciples, we must acknowledge the influence of the general relative depression on Russian theology both from the East and from the West.

Individualistic inclinations corroded society, but God was sending new prophets as zealots and keepers of the Church. In the 18th and 19th centuries there were not only acute social and ecclesiastical troubles in Russia, but also a growth of Orthodox sanctity. This sanctity had its clear expression in the spiritual depth of the famous Russian saints: Tikhon, Bishop of Voronezh and Trans Don (+1783), Paisij Velichkovski (+1794), Seraphim of Sarov (+1833), the great Optina elders and many other bishops, priests and monks, who were building the internal spiritual fence of the Church in time marked by intensive attacks of secularism.

But the other characteristic feature of this time was the formation of Modern Russian theology, which expressed the consciousness of the Church. Its main goal was to liberate itself from alien scholastic schemes, to return to the patristic roots and to turn to actual problems of the world. The most representative figure among those who realized these goals was Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow (1782-1867), one of the most outstanding theologians of the 19th century. He was the initiator and one of the most active participants in the trans-

lation of the Scriptures into modern Russian, an ardent preacher, a deep theologian, wise administrator and humble ascetic. It was he who drew the lines for the main future development of Russian Orthodox theology, and became for many orthodox thinkers a reliable authority.

Many educated Russians of the first half of the 19th century were looking for truth, and this search led them to the church. They found the truth not in classical German philosophy, fashionable at that time among Russian intellectuals, but in living contacts with the church which opened for them the way to understanding the meaning of human life, to solving the problems of freedom and social happiness. We can see the testimonies of these spiritual discoveries in the works of A. S. Khomyakov and two pupils of the Optina elders—I. V. Kiriyevisky (1806-1856) and K. N. Leontiev (1831-1891).

The philosophy of pan-unity developed by V. S. Solovyev (1853-1900) was the next step in the development of Russian theological thought. In his 'Lectures on God-Manhood' (1877-1881) he turned again to the Unity of the Three Persons, to the Image of world created in time, and to the church as realization of God's purpose for the world which became realized through the Incarnation of His Only Son... Another of Solovyev's basic ideas was about Sophia (God's Wisdom), as expression of the internal unity of God as the mode for the Church unity. Fr. Paul Florensky (1882-1943) and archpriest Sergei Bulgakov later developed these ideas of Solovyev. The more conservative theologians based their ecclesiological views on the Unity of the Trinity.

In September 1892 during the Solemn Act in the Moscow Theological Academy on the occasion of the 500th anniversary of the death of St. Sergius of Radonezh, a lecture on 'The moral idea of the dogma of the Trinity' was delivered by Archimandrite (later-Metropolitan) Anthony (Chrapovitsky, +1936). This speech was the answer of an orthodox theologian to the rationalistic attacks of the time. Many Russian intellectuals denied the significance of the dogmas and reduced Christianity to the level of a simple moralistic doctrine. It was the task of this Orthodox theologian to show that salvation could not be

obtained by means of external virtue alone and stress the significance of faith.

Speaking about the incomprehensibility of the dogma of the Trinity, Fr. Anthony said: 'It's easy for me to imagine myself a part of a certain collective notion, i.e. a member of a crowd, a society, an academy, a monastery, but the given notions will not help my self-understanding personality to become one with other personalities, in such a way that it would no longer be possible to think of "several beings", but only of "one being".'

He stressed that members of the Church are called to aspire to experience the Unity of the Trinity as the only way to real knowledge of God. Commenting on the highpriestly prayer of Christ (Jo. 17: 11; 21-24) Fr. Anthony wrote: 'Through mutual love, by the unique work of the Divine Grace the followers of Christ, sanctified by the truth of the knowledge of God would experience that close internal unity, which the Father and the Son have among each other'. The author emphasized that the commandment to love one's neighbour as oneself (Lev. 19: 18; Mt. 22: 39) can only be fulfilled if one believes in the Holy Trinity. Human nature says to man 'that his ego and every other non-ego are opposite beings, and thus, one can love one's neighbour as oneself only on some impulses, love being not the continuous state of one's heart'. Only when one believes in Trinity one can set one's faith against the voice of one's nature because 'the eternal being of the Creator of one's nature is free from this exclusiveness, for being one it is triune Persons. The divided consciousness of man is a lie, the consequence of the Fall, which is destroyed by the Son, who came from the Father but did not separate from the Father; who is calling us to graceful unity with Him. This unity was in reality based on His Incarnation, and everyone can join this unity by conscious changing of one's self-loving and proud nature into a humble and loving one'...

Thus Archbishop Antony again leads us to the Orthodox teaching about the church as Christ's body in which the dispersed are gathered together in unity in the image of the three—hypostatic unity. The same idea can be met in the works

of another outstanding Orthodox theologian of the beginning of the 20th century, Hilarion (Trioitsky, +1929) who gave precisely the same title to one of his articles: 'Triunity of Godhead and the Unity of Mankind'. This idea would find its further development in the ecclesiology of Sergius, Patriarch of Moscow (1868-1944) and in the theological essays of Vladimir Nikolayevitch Lossky (1903-1958).

The peculiarity of these theologians' views is the particular emphasis on unity in the Orthodox teaching on the Holy Trinity as the basis of ecclesiology. Three in One and One in Three—this is the main basis which was dogmatically expressed in ancient times and was again revealed in the works of the Orthodox theologians of the 19th and 20th centuries in its uncomparable moral depth. The latter idea was reflected in the exegesis of the first verses of St John's Gospel. The pre-eternity, hypostatic character and Deity of the Logos was shown as 'the perfect Revelation of the perfect God the Father (M. D. Muretov), 'the contemplation of the Self through the other in the Third One' (Fr. P. Florensky), 'the Revelation of the Self in the Other and the Revelation of the Other in the Self (Fr. S. Bulgakov)—these images of the infinite (sacrificial love were suggested by Orthodox thought to the world of disunited individuals as an incomparable opportunity for the sake of which the Son of God was incarnated, for the sake of which He suffered and rose from the dead and for the sake of which the Holy Church stands invariably on the rock of faith in Him.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bulgakoff, Sergei, Rev. *The Orthodox Church*. London, The Centenary Press, 1935, pp. 224.
2. Bulgakoff Sergei, Rev. *The Eucharist and the Social Problems of Modern Society*. The Journal of the Fellowship, 1933, Sept. N 21, pp. 10-21.
3. Florovsky Georges, Rev. *Ways of Russian Theology*. Collected Works of Georges Florovsky, Vol. 5, Belmont, Nordland Publishing Co. 1979, pp. 381.
4. Kologivov I., S. J. *Essays on the History of Russian Holiness*. Brussels, 1961.
5. Lossky Vladimir. *Orthodox Theology: An Introduction* St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1978, pp. 137.

6. MYSTICISM AND SCIENCE

NITYA CHAITANYA YATI

Introduction

Mystizismus in German means 'the cult of the supernatural' which is looked upon as a favourite field of esoterics and psychic research. *Mystik* in German stands for 'immediate experience of divine-human intercourse and relationship'.¹ Although mysticism has reference to both of these concepts, in the present paper its meaning is confined only to 'the historic doctrine of the relationship and potential union of the human soul with ultimate reality'.²

By science we mean any systematic study which is essentially gravitating toward a search for certitude, the verity of which is communicable to competent inquirers who are willing and able to undergo such disciplines that are required for meticulous studies in which special emphasis is laid on precise knowledge. What is typical of science is its bias to stand as close as possible to the objectivization of any conclusion that is claimed to be true. When a scientist holds the view that science can understand nature, his contemplative counterpart would think that his essential nature is one of 'understanding'. Each time he is favoured by an unpredictable encounter with the mysterious, he rediscovers this inner nature of his. In spite of the divergence of the paths followed by the scientist and the mystic, they are both earnestly looking for certitude arising out of evidences that can satisfy the normative notion of each one's *Self*. Even though a scientist does not want to be called a believer, he has no hesitation to agree that axioms are self-evident and that they do not require any proof. Perhaps he does not see that self-evidence means *evident to his self*. Thus for both the scientist and the mystic, their final reference is to a conviction which is gained through direct experience, an experience that can satisfy the normative notion which each one has tacitly approved as his criterion for belief. When the scientist repeatedly refers to methodically

conceived experiments, the mystic would counterbalance this with his claim that his faith is supported by his intimate experience.

The scientist is looking for an adequate answer to the perennial question, 'What is this world in which we are placed?'. It is interesting for the mystic also to get an answer to this question. However he thinks that it is more important to know what is the Island of awareness that has again and again identified itself with a subjectively-objectivized 'I', an 'I' which is constantly burdened with the compulsion of being surrounded by a deaf, dumb and blind world to which he is committed to act as its interpreter and spokesman. It is rather ludicrous that the immense infinitude of nature sees itself when man sees, knows itself when man knows and hears of its wonder and mystery when man sings of its glory. Narayana Guru puts it poignantly in his *Atmopadesa Satakam*.

Knowledge, to know its own nature here,
has become earth and the other elements;

Spiralling up, back and turning round,
Like a glowing twig it is ever turning.

Mounted on the rotating wheels of a chariot which
have half moments and such for spokes,
the world rolls on;
know this to be the beginningless divine sport
that is ever going on in knowledge.³

To a fresh investigator it may appear that the mystic is ever in search of a transcendence that eludes scientific enquiry and that the scientist is busying himself with the particularities of the immanence of a perennial process of a world coming into being. When the same investigator advances in his familiarization with both the disciplines he would realize both the mystic and the scientist are playing the same game in one and the same field. Carl Jaspers makes this explicit when he defines *existenz*. '*Existenz* is what never becomes object, the origin from which issues my thinking and acting, that whereof I speak in ideas which discern nothing; *existenz* is what has reference to itself and thus also to its transcendence'.⁴

There is a popular peace invocation which says it is from the transcendence that immanence is derived, and even if the immanent passes away the plenum of transcendence will continue in its perfection.

The Scientist's Stumbling Block.

According to Erwin Schrodinger, the scientist steps out of nature and becomes an onlooker to objectivize the world of his scrutiny. He says this procedure is veiled by the following two circumstances. 'First, my own body (to which my mental activity is so very directly and intimately linked (forms part of the object (the real world around me) that I construct out of my sensations, perception and memories. Secondly, the bodies of other people form part of the subjective world. Now I have very good reasons for believing that these other bodies are also linked up with, or are, as it were, the seeds of spheres of consciousness. I can have no reasonable doubt about the existence of some kind of actualness of these foreign spheres of consciousness, yet I have absolutely no direct subjective access to any of them. Hence I am inclined to take them as something objective as forming part of the real world around me. Moreover, since there is no distinction between myself and others, but on the contrary full symmetry for all intents and purposes, I conclude that I myself also form part of this real material world around me. I, so to speak, put my own sentient self (which had constructed this world as a mental product) back into it with the pandemonium of disastrous logical consequences that flow from the aforesaid chain of faulty conclusions.'⁵

In the process of objectivization, the scientist turns away from the colourful world of the poet which evokes in him beautiful nuances of aesthetic appreciation. Instead he is made to content himself with a colourless mute and cold world. This second anomaly resulted in the dismissal of his own self. C. G. Jung resents this in the following words. 'All science (*wissenschaft*) however is a function of the soul, in which all knowledge is rooted. The soul is the greatest of all cosmic miracles; it is the *conditio sine quo non* of the world as an object. It is exceedingly astonishing that the western world

(apart from very rare exceptions) seems to have so little appreciation of this being so. The flood of external objects of cognizance has made the subject of all cognizance withdraw to the background, often to apparent nonexistence.'⁶

A Peep into the Soul's Depth

We understand the complaint of Jung only when we clearly sort out the values which have issued forth from the depth of man's soul. Such values go a long way in making him a socially responsible being who unabashedly sings the songs that enthrall the souls of all at all times, who sculpts and paints wondrous forms that become a norm of beauty, who composes the scales that inspire everyone to join the dance of life and that enable his hands to create what his mind fancies, whether it is another Taj Mahal or a *Voyager* to Venus or Saturn. Considering this rarity in man Teilhard de Chardin says: 'Happy the man who fails to stifle his vision, happy the man who will not shrink from a passionate questioning of the muses, and of Cybele concerning his God. But happy above all he who, arising beyond aesthetic dilettantism and the materialism of the lower layers of life, is given to hear the reply of all beings, singly and altogether: What you see gliding past, like the world, behind the song, and behind the colour, and behind the eyes' glance does not exist just here and there but is a presence existing equally everywhere, a presence which, though it now seems too vague to your feeble sight, will grow in clarity and depth. In this presence all diversities and all impurities yearn to be melted away.'⁷

The happiest of all to the Indian mind is the contemplative sage, whose understanding is established in absolute certitude. Narayana Guru in his *Municharya Panchakam* describes such a wise one:

Asking for nothing, being himself desireless,
Eating what providence might provide
Just for keeping the body, sleeping on the wayside,
Sorrowless, ever conscious of the Self,
Because of the unity of his own and other selves,
That everlasting and peerless state that shines

As his own, he attains, of existent, subsistent bliss.

Whether living in his home or in the forest,
no matter, the yogis ever live with their minds
in the Absolute alone,

Treating everything here like a mirage on desert land,

The hermit ever enjoys bliss in the peerless absolute
supreme.⁸

William James also admits of the quality of unitive understanding which characterizes a thoroughgoing mystic. He says: 'This overcoming of all the actual barriers between the individual and the absolute is a great mystic achievement. In the mystic states we both become one with the absolute and we become aware of oneness. This is the ever-lasting and triumphant mystical tradition, hardly altered by differences of clime or creed'.⁹

Although mysticism is characteristic of having an overall unitive vision, models of mysticism can be innumerable. In *An Integrated Science of the Absolute*, Nataraja Guru refers to varieties of mysticism, based on nature, eroticism, quietism, activism, austere saintliness, and to those rare mystics who use God and Man as inter-changeable terms. The Guru writes: 'freaks and abnormalities should also be included in this ascending scale of mystics. Charlatans, esotericists, as well as beatniks, angry young men, existentialist artists and poets and even certain kinds of hoboes have a certain place. All these types should be given due recognition with scientific impartiality. It is not a question of taking sides, but of putting in order the varied and numerous mystical expressions':¹⁰ Nataraja Guru, however, maintains the view that the best of mysticism rarely produces abnormality. According to him, Buddha and Vyasa represent the best of mysticism as expounders of Absolute Truth. Their intelligence outshines all the lesser forms of emotionalism and sentimentalism, while their imitators can be considered in certain ways freaks or quacks. This does not mean that the best of mysticism will thrive only in the garden of religion. Mysticism can also flourish in a world similar to that of Einstein.

Niels Bohr calls our attention to the International Congress on Light Therapy held in Copenhagen in 1932 where it was

pointed out that even the psycho-physical parallelism envisaged by Leibnitz and Spinoza has obtained a wider scope through the development of atomic physics. These developments force us to adopt an attitude towards the problem of explanation recalling ancient wisdom that, where searching for harmony in life, one must never forget that in the drama of existence, we are ourselves both actors and spectators.¹¹ Although Einstein could not see eye to eye with the Semitic God inclined to hurl punishments on wretched humans, he was willing to pay his homage to Spinoza's concept of God. 'I believe in Spinoza's God who reveals himself in the orderly harmony of what exists, not in a God concerns himself with faiths and actions of human beings'. Commenting on this, Rabbi Herbert S. Goldstein says, 'Einstein points to a unity. If carried out to its logical conclusion, his theory would bring to mankind a scientific basis for monotheism'.¹² The kind of mystical experience which Einstein had is explained by Virgil G. Hinshaw as cosmic religious feeling.

Sir Arthur Eddington recognized the need to supplement the scientist's quest for truth with a search for the realization of higher values. In the *Philosophy of Physical Science* Eddington writes: 'a Scientist should recognize in his philosophy as he already recognizes in his propaganda—that for this ultimate justification of his activity it is necessary to look, away from the knowledge itself, to a striving in man's nature not to be justified of science or reason, for it is itself the justification of science, of reason, of art, of conduct'.¹³

If the scientist's mystical elevation puts him on an ascending ladder of subtle mathematical equations, the mystic tends to become allegoric in giving expression to his mystical visions. There is a good example from Meister Eckhart: 'When God laughs at the soul and soul laughs back at God, the persons of the Trinity are begotten. To speak in hyperbole, when the Father laughs to the Son, and the Son laughs back to the Father, that laughter gives pleasure; that pleasure gives Joy. That joy gives love and love gives the persons of which Holy Spirit is One'.¹⁴

The subtle element of humor in this suggests one entire path of mysticism in which mystical visions, which are difficult

to be expressed, is imparted as explicitly as common sense with the aid of parables and allegories that can be easily deciphered. Four great masters well-known in world literature are Lord Buddha, Jesus Christ, Jalal-ud-din Rumi and Sri Ramakrishna Paramahansa. All of them were quickwitted to give highly suggestive parables to highlight subtle ideas which are of prime importance in the world of enlightenment or God-realization. Two other outstanding examples are Lao Tze, whose examples are rather enigmatic and discernable only by mature contemplatives, and Mullah Nazrud-din whose insight is clothed in ludicrous and witty examples. It is not sure whether Mullah Nazrud-din was real person or legendary figure.

Narayana Guru was also fond of illustrating his spiritual insights with appropriate examples. However, he always insisted on clarity. Once when *Gitanjali* was read out to him, he admired the poetic vision of Tagore, but, advised Nataraja Guru not to write conudrums. This incident had a lasting effect on Nataraja Guru's mind and perhaps was an incentive for Nataraja Guru to renormalize mysticism in terms of precise scientific restructuring. The result was the emergence of his *magnum opus*, *An Integrated Science of the Absolute*, running into three volumes, based on the ten philosophical and mystical visions of Narayana Guru called the *Darsana-Mala*. Nataraja Guru found in the mystical writings of Narayana Guru an all-embracing vision which could be restated in the precise language of mathematical logic.

Mystics who do not find the demonstrative language of science unwieldy to express the sweet-bitter flames of their agony and the subtle nuances of transcendent aesthetics are very often blessed by the muses of poetry, music, and dramatics. For example, read this song of Milarepa:

I bow down to all Gurus,
I pray to the Gracious Ones!
In the East is found the White Lion's milk,
The source of supreme strength;
One will, unless one taste it,
Never understand its power,

Only after drinking can
its strength be felt most deeply,
Yet only the Deva Indra can imbibe it.
In the South, the great tiger
Leaps with all his might;
Great and majestic as this is,
One can never understand it
Without an actual contest.
Only by vying with a tiger
Can one fully appreciate its leap,
But only the great Dombhi Heruka rides it.
In the West, the Jurmo Fish has a bitter gall;
Nothing in this world can taste more bitter,
Yet, without directly sampling it,
None can imagine how it feels.
Only after tasting it
Can one fully understand its bitterness;
But only the Dragon Gawojobo has experienced it.
In the North, great is the power of the Blue
Gem Dragon,

Yet, without a formal contest,
Its strength is never felt.
Only after wrestling with this monster
Can one fully understand its might,
But only the athlete Deva Galugha matches it.
The milk of the White Lioness in the East
Must be poured into a golden bowl,
Not into any common vessel
Lest the vessel break and the milk be lost.
The holy teaching of Naropa and Medripa
Is deep and most profound,
Yet if one does not practice it,
One sees nothing deep therein.
Only after one has practiced can
One fully understand its depth.
This is the teaching my Father Marpa had!
This is the teaching Milarepa practiced.
Milarepa's experience, insight, and instructions
Are always most effective and precise,
Yet those of little weight cannot receive them.

They are only given to the able student,
Yet they all will be imparted
To the monk, my coming heir.¹⁵

Buddhist or Sufi, when a mystic sings he resorts to the same language of poetic allegory. Here is a song by Mohammed Iqbal, translated by A. J. Arberry:

Heart, in the rosebud's view life's mystery;
Truth in contingent there unveiled is shown;
Although it springeth from the shadowed earth,
Its gaze is fixed upon the radiant sun.
Garden and mead are in his radiance dight,
His wine the rose adorns in lustre bright,
None in this world benighted He hath left,
His brand hath kindled in each heart a light.¹⁶

It is hard to find a mystically enchanted bard who can speak common sense in a language familiar to the scientifically disciplined. For the first time when I had the good fortune of conversing with His Eminence Paulose Gregorios, Metropolitan my joy knew no bounds, that at last I had come across a man whose heart was in perfect communion with his head. I am very thankful to the organizers of the Festschrift for giving me an opportunity to express my love and deep reverence to this noble son of India who is perfectly at ease with everyone, everywhere. I wish the Metropolitan a long life and the loving care of the Supreme.

FOOT NOTES

1. Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. Vol. 9, pp. 83.
2. *Ibid.*, Vol. 9, pp. 83.
3. Narayana Guru, *Atmopadesa Satakam*, Verses-33—34, Translation Nitya Chaitanya Yati.
4. *The Philosophy of Carl Jaspers*, ed. Paul Arthur Schlipp, The library of the living Philosophers, pp. 303.
5. Erwin Schrodinger, *Mind and Matter*, Cambridge University Press, pp. 128-9.
6. C. G. Jung, *Erano's Jahrbuch*, 2946, pp. 398.
7. Teilhard de Chardin, *Hymn of the Universe*, Fontana Books pp. 79.

8. Narayana Guru, *Municharya-Panchakam* verses 2, 5. Trans. Nitya Chaitanya Yati.
9. William James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, Doubleday pp. 397.
10. Nataraja Guru, *An Integrated Science of the Absolute*, Gurukulam Publishing House, pp. 339.
11. *Albert Einstein: Philosopher Scientist*, Vol. I, ed. Paul Arthur Schlipp, 'Niels Bohr? Discussion with Einstein on Epistemological problems in Atomic Physics', The library of the living Philosophers, pp. 236.
12. *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, 'Virgil Hinshaw Junior' 'Einstein's Social Philosophy', pp. 660.
13. Sir Arthur Eddington *The Philosophy of Physical Science*, Ann Arbor paperbacks, pp. 222.
14. *Meister Eckhart*, tr. Reymond B. Blakney, Harper, pp. 245.
15. Garma C. C. Chang, *The Hundred Thousand Songs of Milarepa*, pp. 468, 469.
16. F. C. Happold, *Mysticism, A Study and an Anthology*, Pelican, pp. 223-4.

7. ELEUTHERIA AND MUKTI

An Indian Christian Appreciation of 'Freedom'

FR. JACOB KURIAN

Whether in the Christian tradition or in the Indian religious traditions, there is probably no more suitable term than 'freedom' to denote the ultimate calling of man. It is also a fact that in all religious discussions regarding 'freedom' there is a relative and an absolute dimension of freedom; 'relative' in the sense of freedom from and to, and 'absolute' in the sense of final perfection. But these general observations should not lead us to any over-simplification. There are real problems of understanding and interpretation of the absolute dimension of freedom. In the following lines we would attempt a discussion of these problems, in relation to *eleutheria* in the Christian tradition and *mukti* in the non-Christian Indian religio-philosophical tradition.

Eleutheria: The Greek term 'eleutheria' has a wide range of usages. In the Christian patristic literature there are at least six types of derived meanings viz. freedom in the general sense, setting free of souls in Hades, liberality, looseness of expression, impertinence and prayer of absolution.¹ More specifically, the theological discussion on *eleutheria* has brought forth the following levels of freedom: human freedom in general and in relation to God's law proved by possibility of sudden change, freedom through Christ, freedom as quality of saints, freedom of eternal life, freedom as divine quality, freedom as political and religious freedom.²

In the Philosophical and spiritual thinking of the early Church, *eleutheria* had profound significance. But unfortunately in the later years especially in the West, *eleutheria* became limited to shallow, pragmatic freedom in the State, Church and Society. As a result, even today people understand 'freedom' only in relation to an external authority. According to them, as Dr Schmemmann says, 'freedom is the relation to an authority,

and its definition and even experience depend ultimately on the definition of a corresponding authority, for without this authority freedom becomes a meaningless vacuum.³ But in the early Biblical expositions itself, we could observe the insights of an ontological understanding of *eleutheria*. Many of the Christian writers who commented on Gen. 1:26-27 said that the image of God consisted of *Freedom*. They said that man's being in the image and likeness of God, cannot be contradictory to God's essential nature, 'to be free'. Hence, to be like God necessarily mean *to be free like God*.

Among the early Christian writers, Irenaeus, Origen and Gregory of Nyssa are to be credited for developing an ontological significance of *eleutheria*. According to Irenaeus *eleutheria* has more than a psychological meaning in Christian theology. Ideal *eleutheria* was the state of being in the paradise before the Fall. This was not just a possibility to obey or disobey God, but rather the joy of freedom in the presence of God. Hence, to the fallen humanity 'eleutheria' implies primarily an internal transformation and secondarily a total conformity to God's will. Thus, to Irenaeus, *eleutheria* was the condition and endowment for the historical existence; a condition for the being and becoming of man and an endowment for actualising human destiny.

'But man, being endowed with reason and in this respect like God, having been made free in his will, and with power over himself, is himself the cause to himself, that sometime he becomes wheat, and sometimes chaff'⁴ Within the theological framework of a Creator-creature relationship, Irenaeus gave an exalted position to 'eleutheria' by conceiving it as an ontological endowment for self-creativity, rather than a psychological category.

Origen and Gregory of Nyssa developed a negative as well as a positive implication of freedom. Origen devotes a full section on 'free-will' in his *De Principiis*⁵ (Bk. III Ch. I). This had special significance for the background of the prevailing predestinarianism of the Gnostics. In this section Origen discusses the dialectical relation between God's authority and

human freedom, and then comes to the ontological significance of freedom. According to him, the present situation of man on earth is due to a mistake on the part of human soul. It has been enslaved by a corruptible body and corresponding situation. Hence true freedom is liberation of the whole creation from its corruptibility through a real transformation. Positively it will be a state when God will be all in all.

'Let us now see what is meant by the freedom of the creation? and its "deliverance" from bondage'.... When Christ shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, then those living beings, because they have before this been made part of Christ's Kingdom, shall also be delivered up along with the whole of that kingdom to the rule of the Father; so that, when 'God shall be in all' they also since they are part of all, may have God even in themselves, as he is in all things.

'.... When they have been rendered capable of receiving God, then God will be to them "all in all"'. It follows of necessity that then even their bodily nature will assume that supreme condition to which nothing can never be added'.⁶

Gregory of Nyssa is to be credited for a full development of the concept of freedom. As in the case of Origen, so in the case of Gregory, the ontological concept of 'eleutheria' is based on the theological insight of Romans 8: 21.

'The creation itself shall be liberated (*eleutherothesetai*) from its enslavement to disintegration, into the freedom (*eleutheria*) of the glory of the children of God'.

On the one hand, according to Gregory *eleutheria* is absence of sexuality, freedom from the process of birth and death and freedom from the passions of the flesh. And on the other hand it is *parhesia*, meaning bold access into the presence of the Sovereign and *theoria*, meaning capacity to behold God. In brief, *eleutheria* is the likeness to the Creator.

'freedom (*eleutheria*) is likeness (*exomoiosis*) to what is without master and sovereign, likeness which was given us by God in the beginning'.⁷

The above words imply that man's destiny itself is the perfection and actualisation of his potential freedom. 'Freedom means attainment of that dynamic and true nature of Man'.⁸ In other words, the *apokatāstasis* in Origen and Gregory of Nyssa, refers to the fullness of Freedom, by the perfect realisation of the destiny. The full measure of freedom can only in part be realized on earth.

Then, what are the characteristics of this *eleutheria*? Is it just an undifferentiated absolutist experience?

One of the basic affirmations of Christian theology is that the Creator-creature distinction should be kept at all levels of God-man relationship. Incarnation or Christ-event would become meaningful only with such a distinction. 'Growth' and 'difference' are characteristics of any type of created-existence. Hence, it becomes inevitable that even at the perfect level of *eleutheria* there should be scope for 'growth' and 'difference'. But here is a real philosophical problem: What is the logical basis for a 'growth' in infinity and 'differentiation' in eternity? It leads us to a discussion on the whole process of logical reasoning. We cannot fully apply the logical norms of finite-world to the infinite world. For example when we say, 'God sees' we do not mean that God sees as we human beings see with our eyes. There is a higher level of God's seeing. In the same way, we should approve a higher logic in the case of infinity. In such a logic, ordinary contradictions are reconciled, by which God is said to know and see without sense organs. In the same way, there could be infinite growth and eternal differentiation at the highest level of *eleutheria*, provided 'growth' and 'difference' take a higher meaning there. In the same way, perfect *eleutheria* implies perfect 'bliss' and 'love' where bliss and love also take a higher meaning. Now, let us turn our attention to the concept of 'freedom' in *Mukti*.

Mukti: The Sanskrit term 'mukti' is derived from the root, *muc*, meaning to release. In the Indian religious and philosophical heritage, the term is generally used to denote the release from, death, desires, body, *samsara*, the possibility to stay in the mother's womb, attachment, sin, greed, bondage etc.⁹

Gradually, such terms like *kaivalya*, *nirvana*, *nishreyas*, *amrta*, *moksa*, *apavarga* etc., became the synonyms for *mukti* and thus *mukti* attained a positive content denoting the ultimate attainment of man.

In almost all the religious and philosophical traditions of India, whether the so called 'orthodox' or 'heterodox', there is the craving for a state of being beyond the limitation of the present world. And this ultimate goal is implied in the word 'mukti'. It is colourfully pictured with some modification in the Scriptures. Becoming immortal is an essential aspect of 'mukti', in the *Srutis* and the *Smritis*. The *Yajurvedasamhita* says,

'I know that Primordial Man, golden as the sun beyond darkness, knowing him a man even now becomes immortal. This is the way to attain him; there is no other'.¹⁰

But in the Vedas, such an immortality is conceived more or less identical to the full prosperous life on earth itself. The Vedic *Yajnas* are to sustain a cosmic order or the harmonious order of life. Hence true 'freedom' in the Vedas corresponds to the state of life in perfect harmony with God, man and nature. Wherever this 'freedom' was in danger, *Yajna* was the means to safeguard it.

The Upanishads witness to a further development of this notion of 'freedom'. They seem to emphasize an interior and individualistic aspect of *mukti*.

'As in a mirror covered with dust, when cleaned, shines with fresh brightness so the embodied self, is unified on seeing the atman's true nature, attains its goal and is released from sorrow'.¹¹

Such a 'seeing the atman's true nature' was variously interpreted in the so called Orthodox systems of Indian Philosophy. Though every school of Indian Philosophy 'is primarily *Moksa sastra*',¹² there is much difference in explaining the nature

of bondage and the means to *Moksa*. The *Nyaya* and *Vaisesika* schools emphasized the reality of bondage and suggested the true epistemology and metaphysics by knowing which the soul will be liberated. The *Samkhya-Yoga* schools found the problem of man in the interaction between *purusha* and *prakrti* and suggested their separation as the means to liberation. To the *Purva-Mimamsa* also, bondage was real which was to be transcended by proper *Karma*. But to the *Advaita Vedanta*, soul was always free; its bondage was actually unreal and the perfect realisation of this fact was 'the liberation'. According to an eminent *Advaitin*, '....Anything that is newly accomplished cannot stay for ever. If freedom is not the innate nature of the self, if the self is forced to be free, that freedom is not worth-having'.¹³

The state of final freedom is that of perfect peace and bliss in almost all the systems of Indian Philosophy. Of course, this peace or bliss is not that of a finite realm of a subject-object relationship, rather it is that of the infinite level. And it cannot be fully realised, within the phenomenal consciousness. Sankara endorses Andulomi's opinion in this regard: 'Hence the teacher Andulomi thinks that the freed soul manifests itself as the self in which there is no trace of phenomenal existence, which is consciousness itself, which is serene and happy, and which defies all verbal description'.¹⁴ Also, in all the Indian systems, the way to freedom is not easy one. It is that of an intense preparation on the part of man in the individual and social dimensions of life. For example, Sankara prescribes four *sadhanas* viz., (1) discrimination between the temporary and permanent. (2) non-attachment to the fruits of action, (3) cultivation of virtues like control of sense-organs, renunciation of action, endurance, receptivity, concentration, intellectual alertness; and (4) desire for liberation.

We would summarise this discussion on *mukti* with the comprehensive statement of a reputed scholar: 'The entire purport of the *Sruti* is liberation or freedom. Freedom may be interpreted in many ways. It is Brahman, it is *atman*, it is *nirvana* or it can be said to consist in Being, in Happiness, in Release from all bondage. More numerous still are the

ways supposed to lead to it. Right action, true knowledge, and real love are the classical ways',¹⁵

Eleutheria and Mukti:

To give a comparative account of *eleutheria* and *mukti* is all the more difficult. Both the terms refers to the supreme experience in the respective religious tradition. No one can thoroughly comprehend the similarities and differences in the experience 'freedom' in *eleutheria* and *mukti*. If at all somebody dares to do so, he has to check his prejudices (pre-judgement and hermeneutical tools. Hence, we are not attempting here to give a comparative account, rather we would like to suggest a few questions for further discussion.

1. Do *eleutheria* and *mukti* point to the same destiny that would transcend the limitations and imperfections of the predicament of man?
2. Is the scope for 'growth' and 'difference' in *eleutheria* logically applicable in *mukti* also?
3. To what extent is the social dimension of freedom in *eleutheria* similar to that in *mukti*?
4. Transformation of the creation is central to *eleutheria*. Is it the same with *mukti* also?
5. Perfect manifestation of freedom is an eschatological reality in *eleutheria*. Can we say that it need not be the same with the experience of freedom in *mukti*?
6. Can we say that in the Christian tradition 'to be free' means to be like God whereas in the non-Christian Indian religious tradition, 'to be free' means 'to be God'?

NOTES

1. G. W. H. Lampe (Ed), *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1961.
2. Ibid.
3. Alexander Schmemmann, 'Freedom in the Church' in *Church, World Mission: Reflection on Orthodoxy in the West*, St. Vladimir's Press, New York, 1979, p. 180.

4. *A. H.* IV. 4.3 & IV. 37. 1, IV. 39.1
5. *De Principiis* 1. VII.5 (Butterworth's trans. p. 65).
6. *Ibid.* III.VI 9 (p. 254).
7. Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Soul and the Resurrection*.
8. Fr. Paul Verghese, *Freedom and Authority*, CLS-ISPCK-LPH, Madras, 1974, p. 62.
9. Prathibushan Chatterji 'The concept of liberation and its relevance to Philosophy'—Advaita approach in *IPA*, p. 68.
10. XXXI. 18
11. *Svet. UP.* II. 14
12. T.M.P. Mahadevan, *Indian Philosophical Annual*, Vol. 5, p. 5.
13. T. M. P. Mahadevan, *Ibid.*, p. 6.
14. *Brahma Sutrahashya* Iv. Iv. 6 of IV IV. 10.
15. Raimundo Panikkar, *Mantramanjari*, Darton, Longman, & Todd, London, 1977, p. 758.

8. CREATIVE FIDELITY : FROM GREGORY OF NYSSA TO PAULOS MAR GREGORIOS

K. M. THARAKAN

The intellectual enterprise of Metropolitan Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios cannot be understood apart from the philosophical-theological work of St. Gregory of Nyssa, one of the three famous Cappadocians of the fourth century. It was Mar Gregorios who brought the thought of this brilliant father of the church into creative contact with much of the theological and scientific movements of our century.

The Eastern theologians knew for certain that the Western interpretation of Christ was not the same as theirs. The universal Synods saw to it that there was consensus on the fundamentals, on the irrevocable articles of faith. But that was not the end of it although truth is the same; the approaches to it vary; and interpretations differ. What passes as Christian theology in most parts of the world is Western theology which is in the ultimate analysis the outcome of the Western world view. The emphases in Western Christianity is on justice as in Roman Law. In many respects there are no two cultures more dissimilar than the Jewish and Roman cultures, but one can see unmistakable identity between them in their concept of justice and the right of the father as the head of the family to dispense with the other members as he pleased. The only relief available to the guilty was exclusively dependent upon the mercy of the master and the lord, the father. Eastern Christianity too has a high concept of justice, but it transcends it.

The Cappadocians, St. Basil the great, St. Gregory of Nyssa, and St. Gregory Nazianzen saw incarnation not only in the light of divine justice but in God's unbounded love of man. Their theological writings are in the line of the celebrated statement of St. Athanasius, 'God became man so that man might become God'. In Western theology too the ultimate

destiny of man to become the child of God is enunciated; but it is the way more than the end that is stressed and only one aspect of the way. The categories of Western theology are neatly framed, and they are easy to handle. The sovereignty of God, man's first disobedience and original sin, the blood of Christ cleansing man from all stains of sin, man's justification and sanctification by faith—are terms that present Christianity to the world in tabloid forms. That they contain truths that may not be summarily dismissed by any Eastern theologian is undeniable. However the Eastern thinker will with due respect differ from this method of explaining the Christian doctrine. It is at this point that the work of Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios (formerly Fr. Paul Verghese) came across the writings of the Russian Orthodox theologians. In his books he refers to the contribution made by men like Solovyov and Bulgakov, Lossky and Berdyaev to Christian theology. These men found in Gregory of Nyssa a profound thinker who had built a unified system of theology in his writings. So also had Cardinal Danielou. They spurred Fr. Paul Verghese to devote himself to the study of St. Gregory of Nyssa. Western theologians barring a few like Cardinal Danielou had failed to perceive the greatness of Nyssa. Nyssa unlike most of his Western brothers had stressed God's image in man and the freedom man shared with his Creator. Metropolitan Paulos Gregorios shows how Pelagius had exaggerated Gregory's concept of human freedom and distorted it. Augustine strongly reacting to this exaggerated notion of human freedom dispensed with the role of 'works' in effecting the liberation of man and explained man's redemption purely as the gift of God's grace. Metropolitan Paulos Gregorios points out that one may discern the major difference between Eastern and Western theological systems in the differences between Gregory's concept of human freedom and Augustine's interpretation of man's bondage.

Some of the Western thinkers who came after Augustine had covered St. Gregory with adverse criticism. He is denounced as a semi-Pelagian and a Platonist. In his work *The Cosmic Man* Dr. Paulos Gregorios answers all the charges levelled against St. Gregory and holds him up as one of the all time greats in the world of theology. He establishes that a coherent compre-

hensive system of Christian thought can be built on the basis of Gregory's thought. St Gregory, one can see, ranks with Plato, and Augustine, with Sankara and Nagarjuna. It is true some of his thoughts are obscure; but we note that they are more modern than most of contemporary thinkers and very relevant to our times. The Indians will find him much more Indian than most other Indian thinkers.

St. Gregory unlike the great Sankara refuses to contain God and the macrocosm in his consciousness; though he knows that man can never know what eludes his mind. Basing his entire thought on the Biblical dictum that God *is*, he raises the ultimate question *what* God is. The Biblical concepts of the Triune God, and Christ as the Son of God are axiomatic to his system. None of the Christian articles of Faith he repudiates. His interpretation of the Faith is original, dynamic and comprehensive. He brings in the categories of Essence and Energy—even Truth has these aspects. God and the universe are not the same; such a pantheistic thought never entered his mind, nor are they bound in a sequence of chains, or *akolouthia*, with God at the head, the Son just below him, the Holy Spirit still below him and the world further below him. Nor is the universe an emanation from God. Then how can one ever charge Gregory with Platonism, asks Paulos Gregorios. God, said the great theologian of Nyssa, was unknowable in His essence. That God, in His essence is unknowable underscores the huge gap between God and man. How inadequate is the mind of man to apprehend God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit? God in His essence remains unknown, but God in his operations (*energeia*) is known. God's energy is uncreated. God created the universe and man through his *energeia*, which is the expression of his will, and as such man and the universe participate in God's energy. God created man in His likeness and image investing him with supreme faculties and endowing him with freedom. Man was expected to live in communion with God exercising his freedom keeping his energy, the stuff with which he is made in pristine purity. However, he erred and went astray, and his energy grew coarse into matter of different temper. According to St. Gregory man is not beset with original sin, but the proclivity

to non-being is strong in him, evil being nothing other than non-being. Man is thus caught between two equally powerful pulls, one towards the Being which is God and the other towards evil, or non-being or total annihilation. Metropolitan Gregorios contends that in Eastern theology the *telos* for man is not just justification, sanctification or liberation but fulfilling his destiny of being perfect man which can evolve only as a result of a process of divinisation. Man by himself can hardly identify his destiny; he cannot fulfil it all by himself. And hence the incarnation. Christ encompasses the entire universe and is the supreme manifestation of the created energy. Christ is the utmost bound of human thought, the mystery that consciousness can comprehend, but the essence transcends human comprehension and the divine mystery is hidden in Christ, the supreme manifestation of God's energy. Such an august thought on God surpasses all Greek concepts of ultimate reality including the Platonic and leaves the Protestant doctrine of God far behind. It is evident that St. Gregory's theory of human freedom does not militate against God's sovereignty.

Metropolitan Paulos Gregorios shows that St. Gregory's concept of man as constituted of energy is scientific and modern, for according to science, man and the universe are made of matter, and matter is but a form of energy. However, it may not be quite scientific to agree that the deterioration of energy into matter results out of its succumbing to the pull towards non-being. Certainly energy is a higher form of matter. The question is whether the human will when it errs can cause the conversion of energy into matter. This riddle has to be tackled at the spiritual level rather than at the material level. Anticipating the great modern Catholic theologian Teilhard de Chardin, Gregory conceived the whole universe as Christocentric. Man being the very image of God had the freedom either to submit himself entirely to Christ or to renounce him. He who renounces Christ misses the *telos* of Creation, falters in his path and drives himself to non-existence. He who accepts Christ exercises his will in consonance with the will of God as revealed in Christ and expedites the progress of creation towards its ultimate destiny. Man hominises the universe. He grows from glory to glory in Christ.

At the material level St. Gregory presents a universe acceptable to modern physicists. It is a world ebullient and dynamic, ever involved in a process of transformation. In Gregory of Nyssa religion never runs counter to true science.

We find that as a true Gregorian Paulos Gregorios has acquired knowledge in humanities, science and religion. He knows at first hand the modern development in nuclear physics and molecular biology and talks on most of the subjects from family planning to futurology. His book *Science for Sane Societies* consists of reflections on faith, science and the future in the Indian context. A great theologian, he can synthesise things apparently contradictory, integrate thoughts that confront one another and assimilate the best of everything. 'Gregory of Nyssa acknowledges three faculties of the mind—the world observing or perceptive, the critical and the speculative' His thought is all embracing. Contrasting Gregory with Sankara and Nagarjuna who despise the efforts at conceptual clarification of reality through science in the *Vyavaharika* world, Dr. Paulos Gregorios says: 'Gregory of Nyssa is different from both Sankara and Nagarjuna in accepting the full validity and usefulness of the scientific enterprise, nay, he insists that science and art are both from God'.

It is hard to simplify the thought of Gregory of Nyssa. In one perspective Gregory is a *dvaitavadin* like Madhvacharya of India. We have in Gregory God, who in essence remains unknown, not revealed to human intellect in spite of the incarnation of the Son of God, and also the universe, with man and other creatures, constituted of created energy. Both are realities. The created world is not to be dismissed as an illusion born out of ignorance. God transcends time and space, causality and structure. The universe He has created is trapped in time. Creation itself is a process; it has a beginning, a middle and an end. It has its *telos*, its *arche*, and it passes through *chronos*. The universe, as we see in Gregory, has set on a pilgrimage, humanity being at its very centre. It is, as it swerved from its path, that God sent His only begotten Son to the world to guide

it to its destination. Enumerating the faculties God has given to man according to Gregory. Dr. Paulos Gregorios writes, 'Man is not only the image of God, but he recapitulates in himself the cosmos—he is micro cosmos. He is also integrally related to the cosmos not merely a prisoner in it. It has been said by wise men that man is a little world in himself and contains all the elements which go to complete the universe. Nobody in the modern world, not even Marx nor Russell has exalted man in the same measure as St. Gregory. Only Chardin among the modern theologians echoes this conception of the image of man. Gregory's man is free; Paulos Gregorios strongly upholds the Gregorian concept of human freedom. He is not alarmed if man masters genetic engineering or conquers the planets. Man is called upon to transform the universe in accordance with the divine will. However Dr. Paulos Gregorios cautions humanity against the senseless destruction of the ecosystem.

The Human Presence published by the World Council of Churches is a plea for a reverential attitude to nature. He points out that Nature as divinised by Wordsworth and other romantics was not a reality for our forefathers. Now we take it to be the external reality, the earth with its flora and fauna and natural resources. This shall not be destroyed. Man placed between the divine and the animal shall struggle hard to lift the entire creation to God. Man is the citizen of two worlds, yet a whole being with a special vocation to spread the grace of God through the whole creation, animate and inanimate. He is akin to both God and matter 'a member of both families' made to enjoy both the divine and the terrestrial. In him and through him matter is to be redeemed.

According to St. Gregory God has made man responsible for the whole creation, He is the steward of God; He shall never abuse his powers nor even rape the earth.

The achievements of Science are to be valued and treasured; and man has to strive after new discoveries; he shall follow knowledge like a sinking star beyond the utmost bounds of thought. In this enterprise he shall not destroy the sacred

treasure of nature entrusted to him. Nor shall man grow power-drunk, and build towers of Babel. The true King and leader shall be a shepherd who shelters his flock from wolves, feeds them and leads them to pastures fresh and new. Dr. Paulos Gregorios visualises the formation of international and inter-denominational communities in the near future. They shall lead simple, creative lives underscoring the quality of life more than quantity of possession. The new leader shall be a king and shepherd, a man wholly dedicated to the well-being of his fellow beings. Dr. Gregorios is not a simple pacifist; preservation of peace shall not be a cover for perpetuation of injustice. Rebellion and revolutions are part of the historical process for the emergence of a just and peaceful society; but not wars. Dr. Gregorios does not advocate violence. He is dead against a nuclear war as well as exploitation of the earth by greedy and violent men. The good of all through all under the leadership of the wisest is the objective of humanity. In *Freedom of Man* he deals with modern revolutions—most of which have been for the good. Every society needs structures of authority for its subsistence and progress. Invariably these structures throttle human freedom and as they do so there will be revolts against these. Man evolves in the process of dialectics between his desire for freedom and necessity for authority. Human life is a perpetual struggle, a process in which birth, growth, death and resurrection may be discerned at every level, at every layer. And the pilgrimage continues. Man who installs himself totally and completely in Christ grows from glory to glory. He sees in Christ God face to face, and reflects the glory of God. He grows from strength to strength and takes his fellow beings and the world with him.

In the writings of Western theologians St. Gregory's doctrine also is presented in neat categories. There is for example the presentation of grace operating in man as a vertical process and man loving his neighbour as a horizontal process. Dr. Paulos Gregorios never resorts to such tools to analyse St. Gregory. Also in the estimate of Western theologians Gregory is more or less a dualist, *dvaitavadin*. They haven't brought out the full complexity of St. Gregory's thought as Paulos Gregorios has done.

In *Cosmic Man* there is a brilliant analysis of Gregory's concept of *epinoia* as differentiated from Eunomius' concept of *Ennoia*. The *epinoia* of St. Gregory, according to Paulos Gregorios, can compare with Sankara's consciousness, or Prajna of Bhagavad Gita. St. Gregory's concept of evil also deserves detailed study. Dr. Paulos Gregorios shows that in St. Gregory we have the authentic Christian concept of evil. It is easy and the tendency sometimes irresistible to posit a God of evil side by side with the God of good. Manichaeism cast its spell on many a good Christian in the early days. St. Gregory was firm in his conviction, that the triune God alone is the ultimate reality, there could not be a deity equal and opposite seated right at the nadir of the universe. In Gregory evil has no absolute existence. It hasn't been there at the beginning, it shall not be there in the end. Evil is a reality in time, man has to grapple with it, but beyond *chronos* it has no foothold of its own. As to what happens to evil in its encounter with the good is difficult to explain. May be like the tares it may persist with good till the day of harvest. May be much of it is consumed in the process, the good that is engendered is at once absorbed in the eternal world.

The most difficult aspect of St. Gregory's vision is his concept of time, the distance in time. God created the universe at the beginning of time. Time does not apply to God who is beyond time. And with God everything is possible; what he wills is a reality instantaneously. There cannot be any gap between God's wish and its translation to reality. So from God's point of view neither the past nor the future can exist. Only the eternal present exists. If so whatever is to happen has happened; and whatever happened is happening. It is all there, a state hard to visualise. There seem to be two worlds, God's world and man's world. God's world is beyond time and space, eternal, indestructible. Shall we say it enjoys a dynamic staticity. But to put it like that will be to make it human, and even simplistic. And there is man's world trapped in space and time; constituted of created energy. The central question that may be asked is whether this world is a substantial world. Is it a shadow of the real world, is it an illusory world? The former view is Greek, the latter view is Hindu, and St. Gregory of

Nyssa is neither Greek nor Hindu? Also the question arises how can two worlds have the same status as reality, the one is contingent upon the other. The world as we see it is the expression of God's will. Now can God and His will have two separate existences of their own? If this possibility is ruled out, one has to admit that the will-based world has no ultimate existence, that God alone exists, that God alone remains. The Many change and pass. This is to suggest that Gregory's position is tending towards that of the *advaitin*. This is definitely going to another extreme. Yet it helps us draw parallel with Sankara's concept. Also it shows how refreshingly modern Gregory of Nyssa sounds. He is too subtle for many a modern thinker. Dr. Paulos Gregorio's work gives us a consistent, cogent and comprehensive account of Gregory of Nyssa and his thought.

Paulos Gregorios has not only expounded St. Gregory's thought, he has applied it in his discussions on all topics ancient and modern. Faith and reason, religion and science, ethics and economics. Strategies for revolution, and spheres of peace, structures of authority and avenues for freedom go hand in hand in Gregory. The adolescent revolutionary, the vociferous feminist, the belligerent trade unionist, the fiery antiracist, the fearless fighter for justice, the peace-loving sanyasin, the self effacing social worker—each will have St. Gregory contextually interpreted for him by Paulos Gregorios. The system being dynamic and comprehensive it contains 'Gods plenty', and yet everything set in the best order, and analysed to the minutest detail. There are writers who have found it difficult to grasp the thoughts of Dr. Paulos Gregorios. Some even accuse him of being a Communist and a Christian all at the same time. Dr. Paulos Gregorios subscribes to much in the economic theory of Marx; but he is not a marxist, he is not even Marxian. Marx dealt with only one or two aspects of life: How can he compare with St. Gregory who conceived the inconceivable immensity of the universe and spoke about the even unknowable mystery of the essence of God. The heart of the matter is that St. Gregory can accommodate Freud or Marx, Einstein or Heisenberg. Confronted with the thoughts of

modern intellectual giants, Dr. Paulos Gregorios, deep rooted as he is on St. Gregory, remains undaunted. He faces with courage every modern challenge, for he knows that everything is possible with God and he sticks to this faith against every formidable onslaught on faith. His arguments are convincing, his mind is clear; it has fathomed depths unknown to men and women made of everyday stuff poor mortality.

Select List of Books and Articles Written by Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios

1. *The Joy of Freedom*, Lutterworth Press, London, 1967.
2. *The Gospel of the Kingdom*, CLS, Madras, 1968.
3. *Date of Easter and Calendar Revision in the Orthodox Churches*, 1968.
4. *The Faith of our Fathers*, MGOCSM, Kottayam, 1969.
5. *Be Still and Know*, CLS, Madras, ISPCK-LPH, Delhi, 1971.
6. *Koptisches Christentum*, Stuttgart, Evangelisches—Verlagswerk, 1973.
7. *Die Syrischen Kirchen in Indien*.—Stuttgart, Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1974.
8. *Freedom and Authority*, CLS, ISPCK-LPH, 1974.
9. *Quest for Certainty: Philosophical Trends in the West*, Kottayam, 1976.
10. *Truth without Tradition?* Sri Venkateswara University, Tirupati, 1978.
11. *The Human Presence: An Orthodox View of Nature*. WCC, Geneva, 1978 & CLS, Madras, 1980.
12. *Cosmic Man: The Divine Presence*. Sophia Publications, New Delhi—Kottayam, 1980.
13. *Science for Sane Societies*. CLS, Madras, 1980.
14. *The Indian Orthodox Church: An Overview*. Sophia Publications, Delhi—Kottayam, 1982.

Works Edited by Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios

1. *Curriculum Consultation*, Addis Ababa, Conference of the Oriental Orthodox Churches, 1967.
2. "Unofficial Consultation Between Theologians of Eastern Orthodox and Oriental Orthodox Churches, Papers, Reports and Minutes" in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*. Fall 1968, Vol. 13, No. 2, and Spring & Fall 1971, Vol. 16, Nos. 1 & 2.
3. *Burning Issues*, Kottayam, Sophia Centre Publications, 1977.
4. *Science and Our Future*, CLS, Madras, 1978.

Works Co-authored by Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios

1. "Fellowship Unbroken" in *The Report of the 1961 meeting United Presbyterian Women of the United Presbyterian Church*, (1962).
2. "Laity Formation—Framework, Aims, and Principles" in *Laity Formation—Proceedings of the Ecumenical Consultation*, Gazzada, Rome, 1966.
3. "To the Western Church Activist from an Eastern Orthodox Perspective: On Choosing the Good Portion" *Sermons to Men of Other Faiths and Traditions*, New York, Abingdon Press, 1966.
4. "Secular Society or Pluralistic Community" in *Man in Community*, New York, Association Press, 1966.
5. "Christian Education in Orthodox Perspective—Philosophy and Learning Theory," in *Curriculum Consultation*, Conference of Oriental Orthodox Churches, Addis Ababa, 1967.
6. "Le Sacerdoce Royal" in *Prêtres et Pasteurs*, Eglises en Dialogue, no. 6 même, 1968.
7. "The Retreat Message" in *The International Christian Leadership*, Trivandrum, 1969.
8. "The Ethiopian Orthodox Church and the Syrian Orthodox Church" in *Religion in the Middle East*, Cambridge University Press, 1969.
9. "A Sacramental Humanism" in *Theological Crossings*, Michigan, William B. Eerdmans, 1971.
10. "This World and the Other" in *Technology and Social Justice*, SCM, London, 1971.
11. "Secular Society or Pluralist Community"? in *Contemporary Religion and Social Responsibility*. New York, 1973.
12. "Cultural Identity and Perception of Reality" in *Human Identity in Nature, Science and Society*, The Bossey Ecumenical Institute, Geneva, 1975.
13. "Muddled Metaphors" in *Life Boat Ethics—The Moral Dilemma of World Hunger*, Harper Forum, New York, 1976.
14. "On God's Death: An Orthodox Contribution to the Problem of Knowing God" in *What Asian Christians are Thinking*, Philippines, New Day, 1976.

15. "The Dialectics of Theology and Peace Activity" and "The Ideology of Development" in *The Voices of Christians for Peace*, Budapest, 1978.
16. "Knowing as Striving Towards Unity", in *Concern about Science Academic Congress Proceedings*, Amsterdam, 1982.

Select List of Articles

1. "The Syrian Churches in India" in *The Student World* 1958, Vol. 6, No. 1, first quarter.
2. "Will Dialogue Do?" *The Ecumenical Review*
3. "Unity in the Church" in "Prism" Vol. V., No. 1, January 1961.
4. "The Ancient Syrian Church of India, a contemporary picture" in *The Ecumenical Review* No. 3, Vol. 13, April 1961.
5. "Unity of the Body" in *The Student World*, Vol. LV, No. 1, First Quarter, 1962.
6. "What the SCM has Meant to Me?" In *Aikya* May 1962, Vol. 8, No. 5.
7. "The Finality of Jesus Christ in the Age of the Universal History" in *The Ecumenical Review*, Vol. 15, No. 1, Oct. 1962.
8. "The Calling of the Churches to Fresh Service—Can One Serve and Not Love" in *The Friends Quarterly*, Jan. 1963.
9. "The Role of Monasticism and a New Askesis for Our Time" in *The Ecumenical Review*, 1963.
10. "Aggiornamento and the Unity of All: An Eastern Orthodox view of the Vatican Council" in *Ecumenical Review*, Jan. 1963.
11. "What is the Church?" in *World Christian Education* No. 3, Vol. 18, Third Quarter, 1963.
12. "The Cultivation of the Christian Life" in *The South East Asian Journal of Theology*, April 1964.
13. "Pluralistic Human Society" in *Study Encounter*, Vol. 1, No. 2, 1965.
14. "The Nature of the Church" in *The Methodist Women*, Vol. 25, No. 6, Feb. 1965.
15. "The Nature of the Laymen's Commission" in *The Methodist Women*, Vol. 25, No. 7, March 1965.

16. "Christians for Breakfast—Faith at Work" in *The Magazine of Christian Experience*, April 1965.
17. "Ecumenism in the Kerala Churches" in *Kerala Christian Council Silver Jubilee Souvenir*, 1965.
18. "Ecumenical Education—An Introductory Word" in *Study Encounter*, Vol. 1, No. 4, 1965.
19. "New Life in the Church" in *N.C.C. Review*, March and April 1966.
20. "Education and the Nature of Man—Some Related Biblical Concepts" in *Study Encounter*, Vol. II, No. 4, 1966.
21. "New Life in the Church" in *Youth Bulletin*, Central Youth Committee, National Christian Council of India, April 1966.
22. "The Ecumenical Churchman" in *Ecumenical Institute News Letter*, Vol. II, No. 5, May 1966.
23. "Orthodox Churches—Chalcedonian and Non-Chalcedonian" in *Eastern Churches Review*, Vol. I, No. 2, Autumn, 1966.
24. "Some Reflections on the Healing Ministry of the Church" in *Study Encounter* Vol. II, No. 3, 1966.
25. "Vatican II—Gains, Hopes and Hurdles" in *Eastern Churches Review*, Spring, 1967.
26. "Righteousness and the Coming Kingdom" in *The Ecumenical Review*, Oct. 1967.
27. "Authority in the Church" in *McCormick Quarterly*, Vol. XXI, No. 1, Nov. 1967.
28. "Whither the Orthodox Church?" in *Sabha Chandrika*, Dec. 1967.
29. "The Orthodox Church and Its Two Families" in *Souvenir Mar Gregorios Orthodox Church*, Baroda 1967.
30. "Monothelite Controversy: A Historical Study" in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. 13, No. 2, Jan. 1968.
31. "The Spiritual Foundations of Christian Service" in *Religion and Society*, Mar. 1968.
32. "Salvation" in *International Review of Missions*, Vol. LXVII, No. 228, Oct. 1968.
33. "On God's Death" in *Indian Journal of Theology*, October-December 1968.
34. "How Shall We Sing the Song of the Lord When the Poor Perish" in *Risk*, Vol. IV, No. 2, 1968.

35. "Is Christianity a Western Religion?" in *Souvenir, St. Mary's Church, Ahmedabad*, 1968.
36. "Humanisation as a World-Problem" in *Study Encounter*, Vol. V, No. 1, 1969.
37. "Who is the Educated Man?" in *Journal of Christian Colleges in India*, March 1969.
38. "The See of St. Mark and its Contribution to the Universal Church" in *Eastern Churches Review*, Spring 1969.
39. "Some Perspectives on Christian Spirituality—An Eastern Orthodox View" (a Bible Study) in *Religion and Society*, Vol. XVI, No. 2, 1969.
40. "Students in the Asian Revolution" (Bible Study), *Aikya*, Nov. 1969.
41. "The Liturgical Tradition of the Syrian Orthodox Church" in *The Orthodox Youth*, Oct. 1970.
42. "Role of Students in College Administration, in *Journal of Christian Colleges in India*, March 1970.
43. "The Theology of Development Can it Lead us Astray?" in *Indian Journal of Theology*, July-Dec. 1970.
44. "Syncretism and the Quest for Interiority" in *The Christian Century*, Dec. 23, 1970.
45. "Basic Principles of Ecumenism" in *Souvenir, St. George Orthodox Church, Calicut*, 1970.
46. "A Sacramental Humanism" in *The Christian Century*, Sept. 23, 1970.
47. "Ecclesiological issues concerning the relation of Eastern Orthodoxy and Oriental Orthodox Churches" in *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*, Vol. 16, Nos. 1 & 2 Spring & Fall, 1971.
48. "Meditation on the Beatitudes" in *The Church Women*, Vol. 37, No. 8, 1971.
49. "Response to Miguez Bonino" in *Religious Education*, Vol. LXVI, No. 6, Nov.-Dec. 1971.
50. "The 9 that chooses" in *The Christian Century*, June 7, 1972.
51. "Three Dangers in the Theology of Development" in *Theology Digest*, Vol. 20, No. 3, Autumn, 1972.
52. "The Relevance of Christology Today" in 'Wort und Wahrheit' Supplementary issue, No. 1 Dec. 1972.
53. "St. Thomas and Us" in *St. Thomas 19th Century Souvenir*, Kottayam, 1972.

54. "Develop—But Don't Grow"—The Demise of the Rostovian Metaphysics" in *Christian Century*, June 6, 1973.
55. "Future Relation between the Syrian Orthodox Church in India and the Russian Orthodox Church" in *Journal of Moscow Patriarchate*, No. 7, 1973.
56. "Christian Action in the Asian Struggle" in *The Christian Century*, Aug. 29, 1973.
57. "Impact of Western Educational Styles on India's Struggle for Development and Justice" in *New Frontiers in Education*, Jan.-Mar. 1974.
58. "Does Jesus Christ Free and Unite?" Meditation on the Fifth Assembly Theme" in *The Ecumenical Review*, Vol. XXVI, No. 3, July 1974.
59. "What are they Quarelling About?" in *NCC Review*, June-July 1974.
60. "Does Humanity Have a Future? Conclusions of a Five Year WCC Study of Science and Technology" in *Christian Century*, Aug. 21-28, 1974.
61. "A Message to the Church about Evangelisation" in *Concern*, Nov. 1974.
62. "Mastery and Mystery" in *Religion and Society*, Dec. 1974.
63. "The Infallibility of the Church" and the Significance of the Ecumenical Councils in *Wort und Wahrheit*, Supplementary Issue No. 2 Dec. 1974.
64. "Befreit und eint Jesus Christus"? *Okumenische Rundschau* January 1975.
65. "Viel Wissen, Wenig Freude" in *Radius*, Zwanzigster Jahrgang, 1975.
66. "Glaube und Einheit der Menschheit Aktuelle" in *Gesprache*, 23 Jahrgang, 1975.
67. "On the Quality of Life Debate" in *One World*, No. 10, Oct. 1975.
68. "The Glory and the Burden" in *The Guardian*, Aug. 1, 1976.
69. "Muddled Metaphors—An Asian Response to Garrett Hardin" in *Soundings*, Summer, 1976.
70. "Ich glaube an den Heiligen Geist" in *Kirche und Charismas*, No. 35.
71. "Can Philosophy Create Culture"? in *Dialectics and Humanism*, No. 2, 1977.

72. "Servant of Man or Salt of the Earth" in *One World*, No. 24, March 1977.
73. "An Eastern View of Ecumenism" *America*, Dec. 3, 1977.
74. "Prioritiés Ocuméniques" in *Irenikon* No. 2, 1977.
75. "Orthodox Saints and Saint Gregorios of Parumala" in *Platinum Jubilee Souvenir of the Demise of Parumala Mar Gregorios*, 1977.
76. "Social Creativity and the State" *Dialectics and Humanism* Vol. V, No. 1, Winter, 1978.
77. "Über einige Wirtschaftliche Schlusselfragen der Gegenwart" in *Neue Stimme*, 11 Jahrgang, 1978.
78. 'Reflection on Uppsala', in *Journal of Christian Colleges in India*, Oct. 1978.
79. "Ecumenical Priorities—An Oriental Orthodox Works at the Ecumenical Movement Today" in "Star of the East", Vol. No. 1, Jan. 1979.
80. "An Eastern Orthodox Perspective of Nature, Man and God" in *Anticipation*, No. 25, Jan. 1979.
81. "A Panchasheel for Religions" in *The Star of the East*, April 1979.
82. "Hermeneutics in India Today in the Light of the World Debate" in *The Indian Journal of Theology*, Jan.-March 1979.
83. "Pope John Paul II and the Conference of Latin American Bishops" in *The Star of the East*, April 1979.
84. "Why the Churches are Gathering at MIT?" in *One World*, No. 42, May 1979.
85. "The WCC—Target of Concentrated attack from the Right" in *The Star of the East*, July 1979.
86. "Dialogue with World Religions—Basic Approaches and Practical Experiences" in *The Star of the East*, July, 1979.
87. "Are God and Man One or Two?" in *The Star of the East*, July, 1979.
88. "Science, Faith and Our Future" in *New Frontiers in Education*, Vol. 9, No. 4, Oct.-Dec. 1979.
89. "Authority in the Church" in *The Star of the East*, Oct. 1979.
90. "The Element of Modernity in Modern Philosophy" in *The Star of the East*, Jan. 1980.
91. "This Kueng Affair" in *The Star of the East*, April 1980.

92. "Thy Kingdom Come—A Rejoinder" in *The Star of the East*, July 1980.
93. "Fashioning the Future—Some Complex Issues in Science, Philosophy and Culture" in *India International Centre Quarterly*, Vol. 7, No. 3, 1980.
94. "Issues in the Hermeneutical Discussion in the West", in *The Star of the East*, Oct. 1980.
95. "Ecumenical Development Thought Today" in *The Star of the East*, Jan. 1981.
96. "Collaboration between RCC and WCC : Some Random Thoughts", in *The Star of the East*, Jan. 1982.
97. "India in the New Year" in *The Star of the East*, Jan. 1981.
98. "Nonaligned Movement Fights Oppression and Exploitation" in *New Perspective*, Vol. II, 1981.
99. "Justice, Participation and the Gospel" in *The Star of the East*, July-Sept. 1981.
100. "How is Meaning Derived? A Methodological Exploration that Affects the Context" in *Dialectics and Humanism*, No. 4, 1981.
101. "The Council of Constantinople and the Nicene Creed" in *The Star of the East*, July-Sept. 1981.
102. "The Roots of Injustice" in *Christian Peace Conference*, No. 72, 1982.
103. "L'horizon Oecuménique Aujourd'hui" in *Unité Chrétienne*, No. 65, Février, 1982.
104. "The Scientific Temper Debate" in *Bulletin of The Indian Institute of World Culture*, May 1982.
105. "In Him was Life: Biblical-Theological Meditations on the Theme of Life" in *The Star of the East*, June 1982.
106. "The Roman Catholic Church and the Identity of the WCC", in *The Star of the East*, July-Sept. 1982.
107. "The Catholicate in India" in *The Star of the East*, July-Sept. 1982.
108. "Will Vancouver be a Turning Point?" in *The Star of the East*, March 1983.
109. "WCC Fifth Assembly Concludes" in *The Star of the East*, March 1983.
110. "Can We Talk Freely?" in *The Star of the East*, March 1983.

111. "The Meaning of Life : Reflections from an Eastern Orthodox Christian Perspective" in *The Star of the East*, March 1983.
112. "God—To What, if Anything Does the Word Refer?" in *The Star of the East*, June 1983.
113. "Solar Energy in India Today : How Excited Should We Be" in *Southern Chronicle*, August 1983.
114. "The Roots of Communal Conflict in India—Towards a New Integral Vision" in *The Star of the East*, Sept. 1983.
115. "In the Wake of Vancouver" in *The Star of the East*, Sept. 1983.
116. "So What is New in the New Year ?" in *The Star of the East*, Dec. 1983.
117. "The Ministry of the Church—Two Ways of Understanding It" in *The Star of the East*, March 1984.

DR. K. M. GEORGE is Associate Professor of Christian Theology at the Orthodox Seminary in Kottayam, Kerala. He took his doctoral degree in Patrishes from the Institute Catholique in Paris and from the Sorbonne. He has also developed fresh thought on the relation between Truth, Theology and Aesthetics. He has published a large number of articles in English and is a recognised literary writer in Malayalam.

He also is a member of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches.

Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios' other Books by CLS

Be Still and Know	Rs. 6.00
Freedom and Authority	Rs. 10.00
The Human Presence : An Orthodox View of Nature	Rs. 11.00
Science for Sane Societies	Rs. 15.00
	Cloth Rs. 20.00



FREEDOM LOVE COMMUNITY